REPORT RESUMES

ED 019 612

AC 002 462

READINESS OF NEW YORK COOPERATIVE EXTENSION TO UNDERTAKE A FARM LABOR PROGRAM. EXTENSION STUDY, NUMBER 16.

BY- ALEXANDER, FRANK D.
STATE UNIV. OF N.Y., ITHACA
STATE UNIV. OF N.Y., ITHACA

PUB DATE NOV 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.48 110P.

DESCRIPTORS- *RURAL EXTENSION, *LABOR EDUCATION, *EXTENSION AGENTS, *FARM LABOR, *PARTICIPATION, MIGRANT WORKERS, MEETINGS, AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION, PUBLICATIONS, STATISTICAL DATA, UNIVERSITIES, ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, ADVISORY COMMITTEES, MAN DAYS, SURVEYS, ORNAMENTAL HORTICULTURE, COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE, NEW YORK STATE,

THIS STUDY SOUGHT MAINLY TO DETERMINE THE PRESENT NEW YORK STATE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION INPUT ON FARM LABOR EDUCATION, ESPECIALLY FOR YEAR ROUND FARM LABOR, AND TO ANTICIPATE EXTENSION INPUT FOR THE NEAR FUTURE IN THIS FIELD. QUESTIONNAIRES WERE RETURNED FROM 54 OF THE 56 COUNTIES WITH AGRICULTURAL DIVISIONS, ALL 13 COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SPECIALISTS IN AGRICULTURE, 15 DEPARTMENTS OF THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, THE LEADER OF CONSUMER EDUCATION, AND THE EXTENSION STAFF MEMBER OF THE VETERINARY COLLEGE. MAJOR FINDINGS INCLUDED THE FOLLOWING--(1) 23 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES HAD DISCUSSED YEAR ROUND FARM LABOR AND 11 HAD APPROVED EXTENSION WORK IN THAT AREA--(2) POTENTIAL FARMER PARTICIPATION IN FARM LABOR MEETINGS WAS ESTIMATED AT A LITTLE OVER 1,300 FOR 1967-68--(3) COUNTY STAFF INPUT, ASIDE FROM TRAINING, WAS 399 MAN DAYS IN 1966-67 AND WOULD PROBABLY BE 499.5 MAN DAYS IN 1967-68--(4) THE NUMBER OF COUNTY STAFFS INTERESTED IN THE LABOR RELATIONS OF NURSERY, LANDSCAPE, AND GARDEN CENTER OPERATORS WILL PROBABLY RISE FROM EIGHT (1966-67) TO 15 (1967-68)--(5) INPUT BY COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE PERSONNEL IS EXPECTED TO RISE FROM 309 MAN DAYS (1966-67) TO 515 MAN DAYS (1969-70). THEREFORE, ATTENTION SHOULD BE GIVEN TO COLLEGE-COUNTY PROGRAM PLANNING INVOLVING SELECTED COUNTY AGENTS AND ACTIVELY CONCERNED COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE PERSONNEL. (LY)

ED019612

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

READINESS OF NEW YORK COOPERATIVE EXTENSION TO UNDERTAKE A FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Extension Study No. 16

Office of Extension Studies
New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics
Statutory Colleges of the State University
at Cornell University
Ithaca, New York
November, 1967

Author: Frank D. Alexander
Extension Studies Analyst

WHAT THE STUDY TELLS US

Farm leadership is becoming concerned about the problem of year-round farm labor with executive committees discussing the matter in about two fifths of the counties and approving extension activity in about one fifth of them.

- - - - - - - - - - -

Farmers are becoming interested, have agreed to participate in meetings on year-round farm labor, and have followed up agreement to attend with their actual attendance.

- - - - - - - - - - -

The county staffs of the Agricultural Division think farmers are becoming interested in year-round farm labor and estimate potential participation at meetings on this topic for 1967-68 at a little over 1,300.

- - - - - - - - - - -

The county staffs of the Agricultural Division are becoming interested in year-round farm labor with an input exclusive of training of 399 man-days, or 1.7 man-years, in 1966-67 and an anticipated input in 1967-68 of 499.5 man-days, or 2.2 man-years.

- - - - - - - - - - -

The number of county staffs of the Agricultural Division interested in work on the labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators is increasing, rising from eight doing this kind of work in 1966-67 to 15 planning to do this work in 1967-68.

- - - - - - - - - - -

There is clear evidence that the emphasis of the county programs on year-round farm labor is the human relations aspect.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

The extension staffs of at least seven departments of the College of Agriculture are showing an increasing interest in year-round farm labor with the number of man-years of input rising from the actual in 1966-67 of 1.33 man-years (309 man-days) to an expected 1.87 man-years (434 man-days) and 2.22 man-years (515 man-days) in 1968-69 and 1969-70.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

The facts of the study reveal a sufficient amount of interest in year-round farm labor and also labor connected with nursery, landscape, and garden center operations to warrant serious attention to college-county program planning that would involve staff members from the seven or eight departments which have given time to year-round farm labor and agri-business labor matters along with selected county agents. An important aspect of this planning would be determining the departmental staff resources for backstopping whatever program is developed.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

Read Analytical Summary and Conclusions:

Pages 13 to 21

PREFACE

This report is the first of several which will be defined as intelligence reports. These reports are designed to present research findings and conclusions which Extension administrators can use for decision-making and which those concerned with program planning may also find useful.

The presentation of findings and conclusions in reports of this kind needs to be a combination of brief but cogent summaries which busy administrators can utilize and of adequate detail for planners to use in developing programs. It is hoped that this combination has been provided here. The two unbound pages which summarize the summary and pages 13 to 17 of the report, which contain an analytical summary and conclusions, were designed for the special attention of administrators. The more detailed text and the appendices which give county data and lists of both field and college staff members who have worked on farm labor or expect to do so should provide information for program planning.

Efforts to provide intelligence to administrators for decision-making are confronted with a difficult time factor. Research to obtain accurate information under the pressure of a time schedule that will permit the presentation of the information when needed by administrators is not easily managed. However, if the time schedule is not met, the administrator must and will make decisions. This study was initiated around the first of July, 1967 and a preliminary report made available on October 25, 1967. Thus, approximately four months were required to obtain the necessary data and prepare a preliminary report. Another week or 10 days has been required to produce the final report. The author and his very faithful staff are hopeful that the report has been made available sufficiently in advance to provide useful information to both administrators and program planners.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Summary of Findings. 1

Analytical Summary 13

Conclusions. 19

Introduction 23

Methodology. 24

Agricultural Extension Field Staff 24

- Returns from Agents and Specialists 24
- Educational Background and Training 25
  - Relevant areas of study 25
  - Attendance at farm labor training meetings. 25
- Year-round Farm Labor Program: 1966-67 28
  - Position of executive committees. 28
  - Staff input on year-round farm labor. 29
  - Meetings on year-round farm labor and other labor activities. 34
  - Agents' evaluation of participants' reactions to meetings 39
  - Evaluation of farm labor material sent to agents 40
- Year-round Farm Labor Program: 1967-68 42
  - Commitment to year-round farm labor program . . . 42
  - Potential participants for meetings 42
  - Staff input 44
  - Assistance expected of college staff. 48
- Migrant Farm Labor. 51
  - Decisions of executive committees 51
  - Work done and expected to be done on migrant farm labor. 51
  - Information on migrant farm labor 53

Page

Labor Relations of Nursery, Landscape, and Garden Center Operators 54

Current and future activities 54

Total Input of County Staffs on Labor 58

Departmental Extension Staff in College of Agriculture . 60

Returns from Departmental Extension Leaders 60

Input on Year-round Farm Labor. 61

Estimated Man-Years Needed for the Period 1967 to 1970. 65

Farm Labor Publications 66

Contributions of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations. 69

Appendix A, County Data on Labor Activities. 71

Appendix B, Some Brief Accounts and Comments Relative to the Initiation of Year-round Farm Labor Programs 75

Appendix C, Three Farm Labor Programs: 1967 81

Appendix D, Man-Years of County Staffs for 1966-67 . . . 99

Appendix E, Agents Who Are Expected to Devote Time to Year-round Farm Labor in 1967-68. 103

Appendix F, Labor Activities from County Programs and Plans of Work: 1967-68. 109

Appendix G, Relationship of Staff Input on Labor to Total Staff Time. 113

Appendix H, College Staff Members Devoting Time to Year-round Farm Labor. 117

READINESS OF NEW YORK COOPERATIVE EXTENSION TO UNDERTAKE A FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Summary of Findings

I. Introduction

The major objectives of the study were: 1) to determine the present extension input on farm labor education, especially year-round farm labor, and 2) to ascertain anticipated extension input for the near future in this field. While the major interest of the study was year-round farm labor, information was also obtained on recent and future activities relating to migrant farm labor and on labor matters associated with nursery, landscape, and garden center operations.

Questionnaires were returned from 54 of the 56 counties having agricultural divisions, from all of the 13 cooperative extension specialists--agriculture, and from 15 departments of the College of Agriculture, the leader of Consumer Education and the extension staff member of the Veterinary College.

II. Agricultural Extension Field Staff

A. Relevant educational background and in-service training

1. Of the 76 agents reporting none had taken a college course in the field of labor problems; however, 52 percent of them had had one or more courses in social psychology.
2. Three Cornell training conferences or schools on farm labor were offered agents in 1966-67, one for two days, one for one and one half days, and one for a half day. The county representation and number of agents attending was fairly large for two of these conferences. The one which was held for one and one half days was designed for a limited number of agents.

B. Year-round farm labor program: 1966-67

1. Position of executive committees

   a. Twenty-three of the 54 counties reporting indicated that the division's executive committee had discussed undertaking educational work in this area. Eleven of the 23 committees had approved the activity, 11 had considered the activity but reached no decision, and one had considered it and disapproved.

   b. The advisory committees of three cooperative extension specialists had approved work in this area.

2. Staff input on year-round farm labor

   a. Of the 54 counties reporting, 43 devoted staff time to year-round farm labor in 1966-67, with 84 agents being involved.[1]

   b. The mean number of agents working on the program per county was 2.0.

   c. The total number of man-days[2] exclusive of training devoted to year-round farm labor in the 42 counties doing this type of work and reporting was 399, or the equivalent of 1.7 man-years.[3]

   d. The mean number of man-days of input exclusive of training by the 42 counties doing year-round farm labor work and reporting was 9.5.

---

[1] Obviously not all counties reporting activities on year-round farm labor have had their executive committees give formal approval to the activity.

[2] Man-days and workdays are used interchangably in the report.

[3] One man-year equals 232 workdays.

e. The mean percent of total staff time exclusive of training per county devoted to year-round farm labor for the 42 counties doing this work and reporting was 1.56 with a range from .20 to 5.39 percent.

f. Of the three cooperative extension specialists who devoted time exclusive of training to year-round farm labor one gave one day; one, one and a half days; and one, two days.

g. The mean number of man-days of training on year-round farm labor exclusive of regional meetings of agents for the 54 counties reporting was 2.2.[1] Four cooperative extension specialists reported receiving training for a total of four days.

h. For the 48 counties devoting time to either work or training or both, the mean number of man-days devoted to year-round farm labor was 10.7.

i. When work and training are combined, the mean percent of staff time devoted to year-round farm labor for 48 counties either doing work, receiving training, or both was 1.82.

3. Meetings on year-round farm labor and other labor activities

a. Of the 43 counties that gave time to year-round farm labor, 25 held one or more meetings devoted to the matter.

b. For the 25 counties holding meetings on year-round farm labor the mean number of meetings per county was 2.4. Almost two thirds of the counties held only one meeting. Eight counties held from four to eight meetings.

---

[1] A small portion of this training was devoted to migrant farm labor.

c. For 39 county meetings both attendance and agreed-to-attend were reported. For these 39 meetings the total number of attendances was 728 or an average (mean) of 18.7 persons per meeting. The number of agreed-to attendances was 734, or an average of 18.8 persons per meeting. The one cooperative extension specialist who held a meeting reported 25 agreeing to attend and 20 actually attending.

d. For the 53 meetings held on year-round farm labor and on which attendance was reported, 1,303 attendances were reported for an average (mean) of 24.6 persons per meeting.

e. Of the 24 different topics or groups of topics those considered most frequently were: work incentives or work schedules, or work incentives and motivations; compensation, or salary and fringe benefits; dairy farm labor; management problems and practices; perceptions and attitudes; general discussion of labor.

f. The leaders for 55 meetings were reported. A county agricultural agent or agents provided the leadership at 30 of these meetings and at seven other meetings they shared leadership with others. A professor of Agricultural Economics (Cornell) was the leader at 10 meetings.

g. Mass media, i.e., County News, newsletters, and TV and/or radio were widely used by agents as a means of informing and teaching farm operators concerning farm labor matters.

4. Agents' evaluation of participants' reactions to year-round farm labor meetings: 1966-67

a. Sixty-five percent of 26 agents thought that all or most of the farmers attending participated.

b. Eighty-one percent of 26 agents felt that the general reaction at the end was favorable.

c. Sixty-three percent of 27 agents thought that most were interested in continuing such discussions.

5. Evaluation of four farm labor publications sent to agents

   a. For three of the publications a sizable number could not recall receiving the, ranging from 10 to 18 out of 41 (or 40).

   b. The numbers actually evaluating the publications were not large, ranging from 10 to 24. The two publications considered very useful by the largest percentages of those evaluating were: Human Relations on Dairy Farms (32 percent) and Six Case Studies of Dairy, Fruit, Vegetable and Poultry Farms (29 percent).

C. Year-round farm labor program: 1967-68

1. Commitment to year-round farm labor program

   a. Forty-four of the 53 counties reporting indicated they would devote time to year-round farm labor in 1967-68, five were negative, and four uncertain.

   b. Of 13 cooperative extension specialists, three indicated they would devote some time to year-round farm labor, five were negative, and five uncertain.

2. Potential participants for meetings

   a. Twenty-one counties which had already held meetings on year-round farm labor estimated that a total of 748 farmers, or 35.6 persons per county, could be interested in attending some new meetings and the 22 counties planning initial meetings estimated that a total of 589, or 26.8 persons per county, could be interested.

   b. The 43 counties estimated their total possible participation at 1,337, or 31.1 persons per county. In addition one cooperative extension specialist estimated a potential group of 25 operators.

3. Staff input

a. The number of agents expected to devote time exclusive of training to year-round farm labor in 1967-68 was estimated at 80, or 2.0 per county for the 40 counties planning to do work and reporting.

b. The mean number of man-days of staff input exclusive of training estimated for 1967-68 by the 34 counties reporting and planning to do work on year-round farm labor was 14.7, compared to 9.5 for the 42 counties reporting this type of work in 1966-67. Ten, or 30 percent, of the 34 counties expected to devote 20 or more man-days to year-round farm labor.

c. The total number of man-days exclusive of training which the 34 counties expected to devote to year-round farm labor in 1967-68 was 499.5 (2.2 man-years) compared to 399 for 42 counties in 1966-67 (1.7 man-years).

d. The mean number of agents per county expected to be trained in 1967-68 for year-round farm labor work was 1.8. Eight counties, or 22 percent, of the 37 would want from three to six members of their staffs trained for this work.

e. One cooperative extension specialist wanted one day of training and two asked for two days.

f. The mean number of man-days of training on year-round farm labor wanted for the staffs of the 36 counties reporting and planning to work in this field was 3.6. This training would involve 65 agents for an average of 2.0 days per agent. The amount of training asked for was somewhat above that received in 1966-67 both on a per county and per agent basis.

g. The estimated mean number of man-days of input including training of the 33 counties reporting and indicating that some work on year-round farm labor would be done in 1967-68 was 18.3. This average was considerably higher than the per county average of 10.7 for 48 counties in 1966-67. It is quite possible that this difference in part reflects the fact that there were some counties not reporting on days of input or not intending to do work in 1967-68 which had relatively small inputs in 1966-67.

4. Assistance expected of college staff

a. The 38 counties reporting and planning year-round farm labor activities wanted 96 man-days of assistance in the county from the college staff, or an average of 2.5 days per county.

b. Two cooperative extension specialists wanted one day of assistance from the college staff and one wanted two days.

c. Participation in county meetings was the kind of service most frequently asked of the college staff with 26 counties indicating the desire for this kind of assistance.

D. Migrant farm labor

1. Decisions of executive committees

a.. Eight of the 54 counties reporting indicated their executive committees had considered undertaking work on migrant farm labor. Activity in the field had been approved by five committees and no decision made by three committees.

2. Work done (for the most part exclusive of giving requested information): 1966-67
    a. Eighteen of the 54 counties reporting indicated work done on migrant farm labor in either 1965-66, or 1966-67, or both years.[1]
    b. The mean number of man-days of input on migrant farm labor by the 14 counties doing some work and reporting was 3.8 in 1965-66 and 4.9 for 15 counties in 1966-67. The range in 1965-66 was from one to 10 and in 1966-67 from one to 18. One cooperative extension specialist had done some work in this area.
    c. The most frequently mentioned activities of the counties doing work in this area were: work with other agencies, counseling with individual farmers, and working with migrant labor committees.
3. Information on migrant farm labor
    a. Thirty of the 54 counties reporting and two cooperative extension specialists indicated that they had received requests for information (government policy, laws, and regulations) on migrant farm labor. Twenty-four counties and the two cooperative extension specialists indicated they had the required information.
    b. The respondents listed 13 different sources from which they obtained information on migrant farm labor.

E. Labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators

1. Current and future activites
    a. Thirty counties had done no work in this area in

---

[1] Fourteen of these 18 counties reported that they had requests for information on migrant labor and that they were able to meet the requests. Thirteen additional counties indicated little or no migrant labor involved in their agriculture.

1966-67 and did not expect to do so in the future; eight counties reported activities in 1966-67 and intent to continue some or all of these; and seven reported no activities in 1966-67, but an interest in future activities.

b. The number of man-days of staff input for the eight counties doing work in this field in 1966-67 was 36.5.

c. The 15 counties expecting to do work on the labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators estimated a total of 43 man-days of college staff time would be needed in the county in 1967-68, of which 23 days would come from the College of Agriculture and 20 days from the School of Industrial and Labor Relations.

F. Total input of county staffs on labor

1. The total input on labor for 53 counties in 1966-67 was 630.5 man-days, or 2.7 man-years. This total included work on year-round farm labor, migrant farm labor, and labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators, and training on labor.
2. The mean number of man-days of input per county was 11.9. The range was from zero to 62.5 days. Eleven counties, or 21 percent, devoted 20 or more days to this work.
3. The mean percent of total staff time devoted to all labor activities including training was 2.05 with a range from 0 to 5.93.

III. Departmental Extension Staff in College of Agriculture

A. Questionnaires were obtained from 15 departmental leaders, the leader of Consumer Education, and the extension staff member in the Veterinary College.

B. Input on year-round farm labor

1. Seven departmental leaders, the leader of Consumer Education, and the extension staff member of the Veterinary College reported no work or anticipated work in this area.
2. A total of 309.5 man-days, or 1.33 man-years of input was reported by eight departments for 1966-67.
3. The three departmental extension staffs which contributed the highest percentages out of the total of 309.5 man-days were Animal Science, Agricultural Economics, and Conservation.
4. Of seven kinds of activities on which extension leaders reported, talks or discussion leadership for special groups had the largest number of man-days of input, 141, or 46 percent of the total of 309.5.
5. The number of staff members devoting time to year-round farm labor ranged from two to seven. A total of 31 members did some work in this area.
6. For those departmental staff members doing year-round farm labor work, 5.9 percent of their extension time was devoted to this activity in 1966-67.
7. The percent of their total extension staff time devoted to year-round farm labor in 1966-67 by the eight departmental staffs having members doing work in this area was 2.0.

C. Estimated man-years needed for the period 1967 to 1970

1. For the seven departments making future estimates the total number of man-years of actual input was 1.30 for 1966-67. The estimated total for 1967-68 rose to 1.87, in 1968-69 to 2.22, and remained at 2.22 for 1969-70.

D. Farm labor publications: 1965-67

1. Nineteen publications dealing with labor have been produced by the departments of the College of Agriculture (1965-67), one was in process, and another in the planning stage.

IV. Contributions of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations

A. Three professors have participated in the Extension Farm Labor Program. One has given from 10 to 15 percent of his academic time during 1966-67, another has made three presentations on farm labor and a third has made two such presentations. A district field representative of the school has given two days to the activity.

Analytical Summary

I. Leadership interest--executive and advisory committees

   A. Year-round farm labor--23 considered, 11 approved activity, 11 discussed but no decision, and one disapproved; three advisory committees of cooperative extension specialists approved.

   B. Migrant farm labor--8 considered and 5 approved.

II. Farmer interest in year-round farm labor

   A. Agreed-to-attend and attendance were close for 40 meetings.

   B. Attendance at these 40 meetings was 748, an average per meeting of 18.7.

   C. Fifty-three meetings reported with total attendances of 1,303, or 24.6 persons per meeting.

   D. Of 43 counties reporting work, 25 held one or more meetings.

   E. Around three fifths or more of agents evaluated their meetings as follows: fully participated in by attendants, favorable reaction of participants at end, and participants interested in continuing such discussions.

   F. Estimated total potential number of participants for 43 counties and one cooperative extension specialist in 1967-68 was 1,362; or for the 43 counties 31.1 persons per county.[1]

III. County extension staff interest in year-round farm labor

   A. In 1966-67

      1. Staff input

         a. Forty-three counties reported some work.

         b. Forty-two counties reporting gave 399 man-days (excluding training), or 1.7 man-years; average per county 9.5 man-days.

         c. Mean percent of total staff time (excluding training) for 42 counties was 1.56, with a range from .20 to 5.39.

         d. Mean number of man-days of training (exlusive of agents' regional meetings) was 2.2 for 54 counties.

---

[1] Mean of 31.1 is based on 1,337 (1,362 minus 25 estimated by cooperative extension specialist).

e. Mean number of total man-days of input including training was 10.7 for 48 counties.

f. When work and training are combined, the mean percent of total staff time for 48 counties was 1.82.

g. Three cooperative extension specialists devoted from one to two days.

B. In 1967-68

1. Anticipated staff input

a. Forty-four of 53 counties reporting indicated work would be done in 1967-68.

b. Three cooperative extension specialists will do work in 1967-68.

c. An average of 2.0 agents per county in 40 counties will work on program, involving 80 agents.

d. Man-days of input exclusive of training estimated by 34 counties was 499.5, or 2.2 man-years, greater than for 42 counties in 1966-67 with 399 man-days, or 1.7 man-years.

e. Training wanted by 36 counties would involve 65 agents averaging 2.0 days per agent, greater than that given in 1966-67.

f. Mean number of man-days including training estimated for 33 counties was 18.3, higher than 1966-67.

2. Anticipated need of assistance from college extension staff

a. Thirty-eight counties indicated wanting 95 man-days of assistance in the county, or an average of 2.5 days per county.

b. Twenty-six counties wanted assistance with meetings.

IV. Emphasis of counties in year-round farm labor program

A. Of 24 different topics or groups of topics those considered most frequently were: work incentives or work schedules, or work incentives and motivations; compensation, or salary and fringe benefits; dairy farm labor; management problems and practices; perceptions and attitudes; and general discussion of labor.

1. The direction of the emphasis is toward human relations concerns.

V. County extension staff interest in migrant farm labor

A. In 1965-66 and 1966-67

1. Staff input

a. Eighteen counties had done work on migrant farm labor in 1965-66 or 1966-67, or both years.

b. Fourteen counties reporting and doing work averaged 3.8 man-days of input in 1965-66 and 15 averaged 4.9 days of input in 1966-67.

VI. County extension staff interest in labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators

A. In 1966-67 and 1967-68

1. Staff input

a. Eight counties had done some work and planned to continue.

b. Seven counties were interested in future work.

c. Fifteen counties wanted 43 man-days of assistance in the county from staffs of College of Agriculture and School of Industrial and Labor Relations.

VII. County extension staff interest in all types of labor including training

A. In 1966-67

1. Staff input

a. For 53 counties reporting the total input including training was 630.5 man-days, or 2.7 man-years.

b. The mean for the 53 counties was 11.9 man-days; 11 counties devoted 20 or more man-days to labor matters.

c. The mean percent of total staff time devoted to labor was 2.05 for the 53 counties with a range from zero to 5.93.

VIII. College of Agriculture extension staff interest in year-round farm labor

A. In 1966-67

1. Staff input

a. Eight departments devoted 309.5 man-days, or 1.33 man-years to year-round farm labor work.

b. Thirty-one staff members did some work in this area.

c. Five and nine tenths percent of the extension staff time of those doing year-round farm labor work was devoted to this activity.

d. Two percent of the extension staff time of the eight departments was devoted to this work.

B. In 1967-68, 1968-69, and 1969-70

1. Anticipated staff input of the seven departments[1]

a. 1967-68--1.87 man-years (434 man-days)

b. 1968-69--2.22 man-years (515 man-days)

c. 1969-70--2.22 man-years (515 man-days)

C. Publications on farm labor: 1965-67

1. Five departments listed 19 publications produced, one in process, another in the planning stage

IX. School of Industrial and Labor Relations interest in year-round farm labor

A. In 1966-67

1. Staff input

a. Ten to 15 percent of time of one professor

b. One professor made three presentations on farm labor and another two.

c. A district field representative of the school devoted two days to the activity.

X. Assistance in counties asked for in future (1967-68) and that contributed by college extension staff in 1966-67

A. Counties wanted assistance in county of college extension staff for:

1. Year-round farm labor work in 1967-68--95 man-days

2. Labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators in 1967-68--43 man-days

3. Total man-days wanted--138

B. In 1966-67 college extension staff provided:

1. For year-round farm labor work in counties--133 man-days

---

[1] One department gave no estimate for the future. The actual number of man-years of input for 1966-67 for the seven departments was 1.30.

2. For labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators--19 man-days.
3. Total man-days provided--152.
4. Total contributed by departments in 1966-67 exceeds that wanted by counties in 1967-68; but there may be a problem of kind of services wanted.

XI. Training for year-round farm labor wanted in 1967-68 and that given by college extension staff in 1966-67

A. Mean number of man-days of training on year-round farm labor wanted by 65 agents was 2.0 in 1967-68.

B. The total number of man-days devoted to training on year-round farm labor by the college staff in 1966-67 was 38.[1]

C. Statistically it would appear that there should be an adequate number of college man-days which could be devoted to training. Undoubtedly, the real problem is the proper distribution of this staff time according to qualifications for doing the training needed by the agents.

---

[1] A very small portion of this training was devoted to migrant farm labor.

Conclusions

1. Farm leadership is becoming concerned about the problem of year-round farm labor with executive committees discussing the matter in about two fifths of the counties and approving extension activity in about one fifth of them.

2. Farmers are becoming interested, have agreed to participate in meetings on year-round farm labor, and have followed up agreement to attend with their actual attendance.

3. The county staffs of the Agricultural Division think farmers are becoming interested in year-round farm labor and estimate potential participation at meetings on this topic for 1967-68 at 1,337.

4. The county staffs of the Agricultural Division are becoming interested in year-round farm labor with an input exclusive of training of 399 man-days, or 1.7 man-years in 1966-67 and an anticipated input in 1967-68 of 499.5 man-days, or 2.2 man-years.

5. The county staffs of the Agricultural Division in almost one third of the counties are doing some work on migrant farm labor, but in only a few counties have executive committees approved this activity.

6. The number of county staffs of the Agricultural Division interested in work on the labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators is increasing, rising from eight doing this kind of work in 1966-67 to 15 planning to do this work in 1967-68.

7. The county staffs of the Agricultural Division are showing an interest in all phases of labor relating to agriculture including floriculture and ornamental horticulture with a total input in 1966-67 including training of 630.5 man-days, or 2.7 man-years.

8. There is clear evidence that the emphasis of the county programs on year-round farm labor is the human relations aspect.

9. The extension staffs of at least seven departments of the College of Agriculture are showing an increasing interest in year-round farm labor with the number of man-years of input rising from an actual in 1966-67 of 1.33 man-years (309 man-days) to an expected 1.87 (434 man-days) in 1967-68 and 2.22 (515 man-days) in 1968-69 and 1969-70.

10. While the staff input of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations probably amounts to about .15 of a man-year, this input has been directed to the principal emphasis (human relations) of the county programs.

11. While the assistance wanted by counties from the extension staff of the College of Agriculture either for their labor program or for training for this program in 1967-68 hardly exceeds the input of the college staff in 1966-67, the kinds of assistance needed, particularly in the area of training, may not be the kind of assistance the college staff is prepared or oriented to give.

12. If the conclusion stated in (11) is true, extension administration needs to decide on its basic interest in labor (including both farm and agri-business) and firm up a working relationship with the School of Industrial and Labor Relations or see to it that the extension field staff of the College of Agriculture has the resources for conducting the program.

13. The facts of the study reveal a sufficient amount of interest in year-round farm labor and also labor connected with nursery, landscape, and garden center operations to warrant serious attention to college-county program planning which would involve staff members from the seven or eight departments which have given time to year-round farm labor and agri-business labor matters along with selected county agents. An important aspect of this planning would be determining the departmental staff resources for backstopping whatever program is developed.

READINESS OF NEW YORK COOPERATIVE EXTENSION TO UNDERTAKE A FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Introduction

Increasingly administrators in large organizations are finding it necessary to have adequate information for decision-making which is concerned with future activities. After discussions with the Leader of the Office of Extension Studies, the former Director of New York Cooperative Extension and his three associate directors asked that within the next year or so Extension Studies give considerable attention to investigations that would provide the directors with intelligence upon which they might base their decisions. To this end each of the associate directors has indicated an area which he or she considered especially appropriate for the Office of Extension Studies to investigate and on which an intelligence report would be prepared. The investigations and reports were to be designed in such a manner that the findings would provide substantial information for decision-making.

This is the first of the series of intelligence reports which will be prepared within the next fiscal year. The area of concern was designated by Associate Director Clifford Harrington, whose principal area of extension interest is agricultural programming.

The major objectives of the study were: 1) to determine the present extension input on farm labor education, especially year-round farm labor, and 2) to ascertain anticipated extension input for the near future in this field. While the major interest of the study was year-round farm labor, information was also obtained on recent and future activities relating to migrant farm labor and on labor matters associated with nursery, landscape, and garden center operations.

Methodology

The basic information for the study was obtained by means of structured questionnaires sent to the county agricultural division leaders and those agents who had responsibilities for farm labor education, to cooperative extension specialists--agriculture, and to the leaders of the departmental extension staffs of the College of Agriculture. The questionnaires for both agents and departmental extension leaders were first sent out around July 14, 1967. A second mailing to agents who had failed to respond to the first distribution was conducted around August 15, 1967. The agent leaders who failed to respond to this second issue of the questionnaire along with the department extension leaders who had failed to return their questionnaires were then telephoned and requested to make their returns. All of the 13 cooperative extension specialists--agriculture returned their questionnaires promptly so that with them no follow-up was required.[1]

Agricultural Extension Field Staff[2]

Returns from Agents and Specialists

Of the 56 counties having agricultural divisions, 54 made returns. One of the two counties not returning a questionnaire had no agricultural agent and the other county contracted with an adjoining county for its work with commercial farmers. Each county was sent a Form I questionnaire to be filled out by the divisional leader and a Form II questionnaire for each additional staff member (to be completed by only those members having farm labor responsibilities). Fifty-four Form I questionnaires and 12 applicable Form II questionnaires were returned. As noted previously all of the cooperative extension specialists returned their questionnaires.

---

[1] One of the cooperative extension specialists was leader of a county agricultural division for the greater part of 1966-67. He recognized this is filling out his questionnaire. Consequently, 1966-67 data from his questionnaire were classified with the data provided by the county divisional leaders but his data for 1967-68 were classified with those of the cooperative extension specialists.

[2] See Appendix A for county data relating to this part of the report.

Educational Background and Training

Relevant areas of study. The county agents and the cooperative extension specialists were asked to indicate those areas of study relevant to farm labor matters in which they had taken one or more college courses. The areas listed in the questionnaire were labor problems, labor economics, personnel management, social psychology, or other (to be written in). Approximately one third of the total number had had no relevant courses (Table 1). None of them had taken a course in the field of labor problems. The area which was most frequently checked was social psychology. Forty, or 52 percent, of the total (including combinations) had taken one or more courses in this field. The general picture is one in which a number of the respondents have been exposed to fields of study that would provide them with at least a minimum apperceptive background for in-service training in the field of farm labor problems, especially the human relations aspects.

Attendance at farm labor training meetings. During 1966-67 four types of meetings or conferences were devoted partially or entirely to a consideration of farm labor. The number of counties represented and attendance of agents at

Table 1

Number and Percentage Distribution of County Agricultural Agents and Cooperative Extension Specialists--Agriculture According to Fields of Study

Fields of study	Leaders of Agr. Division		Other agents responsible for farm labor		Cooperative extension specialists		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
No related courses taken	19	36	2	17	4	31	25	33
1. Labor problems	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2. Labor economics	--	--	1	8	--	--	1	1
3. Personnel management	2	4	--	--	--	--	2	3
4. Social psychology	8	16	4	34	4	31	16	21
5. Other[a]	5	10	3	25	--	--	8	11
6. Combinations of the above:								
3 & 4	3	6	--	--	3	23	6	8
3, 4, 5	3	6	--	--	1	8	4	5
4 & 5	8	16	1	8	1	8	10	13
1, 2, 4	1	2	1	8	--	--	2	3
2, 3, 4	1	2	--	--	--	--	1	1
1, 3, 4, 5	1	2	--	--	--	--	1	1
Total	51	100	12	100	13	101[b]	76	100

[a] Other included these courses:

Farm management	5
Psychology--educational, industrial, or general	5
General sociology and psychology	3
Rural sociology or sociology	3
Administration and supervision, rural social problems, Manpower policy, and others	1
Business management	1
Farm management and community organization	1
General economics, sociology, psychology, including psychology of counseling	1
Human relations, group action, anthropology	1
Rural sociology and public relations	1
Social organization and administration	1

[b] Total is more than 100 percent because of rounding.

these meetings is presented in the following tabulation:

Type of meeting	No. of counties represented	No. of county agents present	No. of coop. ext. specialists present
Farm Labor Conference Oct. 26 & 27, 1966 --2 days[1]	27	30	1
Farm labor session of Agr. Econ. Conf. Dec. 14, 1966--half day	44	84	4
Farm Labor Training Session, March 2 & 3, 1967--1.5 days[1]	7	10	0
One or more regional meetings at which farm labor was considered	11	18[2]	5

The Farm Labor Conference of Oct. 26 and 27, 1966 and the Farm Labor Training Session of March 2 and 3, 1967 were the important farm labor training meetings for 1966-67. At the first of these two meetings almost half of the state's counties with Agricultural Divisions were represented. Five of the 10 agents who attended the second training meeting also attended the first one. The second meeting involved intensive training for a limited number of agents on human relations on the farm under the leadership of William W. Frank, Assistant Professor, Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University.

---

[1] Most of the time of these training meetings appears to have been devoted to year-round farm labor.

[2] The 18 agents and five cooperative extension specialists reported on the number of regional meetings attended at which farm labor was considered. The distribution according to number of meetings attended by the two groups was as follows:

	No. of agents	No. of specialists
One meeting	14	1
Two meetings	2	3
Three meetings	1	1
Six meetings	1	--

Year-round Farm Labor Program: 1966-67[1]

Position of executive committees. Twenty-three of 54 counties[2] reported that the division's executive committee had discussed undertaking an educational effort on year-round farm labor. The positions taken by the committees were as follows:

	No. of committees
Approved	11
No decision	11
Disapproved	1

The counties whose committees had approved the activity were:

- Columbia
- Cortland
- Jefferson
- Livingston
- Monroe
- Saratoga
- Schoharie
- Seneca
- Steuben
- Tompkins
- Wayne

The counties whose committees had considered the matter but not arrived at a decision were:

- Broome
- Chautauqua
- Chemung
- Dutchess
- Lewis
- Madison
- Niagara
- Orleans
- Tioga
- Washington
- Wyoming

---

[1] See Appendix B for brief accounts and comments relative to initiation of year-round farm labor programs and Appendix C for detailed accounts by agents of three county farm labor programs in 1967.

[2] One county which did not report had contracted the servicing of its commercial agriculture to an adjoining county and one county was without an agricultural agent.

The county whose committee had disapproved the activity was:

Schenectady

Three cooperative extension specialists indicated that their advisory committees had approved their conducting educational work in this area.

Staff input on year-round farm labor. Of the 54 counties reporting[1] 43 devoted some staff time to year-round farm labor in 1966-67.[2] Involved in this work were 84 agents. The mean number of agents working on the activity per county was 2.0. In 20, or 46 percent, of the counties only one agent was involved; however, three counties had four, and one had six (Table 2).[3]

Table 2

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According to Number of Agents Who Devoted Time to Year-round Farm Labor: 1966-67

No. of agents	Counties	
	Number	Percent
1	20	46
2	11	26
3	8	19
4	3	7
5	--	--
6	1	2
Total	43	100
Mean	2.0	

---

[1] One county had no agricultural agent at the time of the survey and another county had contracted its commercial agricultural activities to an adjoining county.

[2] It should be noted that while 43 counties devoted time to year-round farm labor, only 11 counties reported formal discussion and approval by executive committees of a year-round farm labor program.

[3] See Appendix D for distribution of counties according to number of agent man-years of the staff for 1966-67.

The total number of workdays devoted to year-round farm labor in the 42 counties doing work in this area and reporting was 399.[1] If 232 workdays is used as the number of days constituting a man-year for an agricultural agent, then for these 42 counties, a total of 1.7 man-years was devoted to year-round farm labor.[2]

The number and percentage distribution of the 53 counties reporting on number of days of staff input is given in Table 3.[3]

Table 3

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According to Number of Staff Workdays Devoted to Year-round Farm Labor (Exclusive of Training): 1966-67

No. of workdays	Counties Number	Counties Percent
None	11	21
1 - 4	18	34
5 - 9	11	21
10 - 14	2	4
15 - 19	4	7
20 - 24	2	4
25 - 29	4	7
30+	1	2
Total	53[a]	100
Mean (including 0)	7.5	
Mean (excluding 0)	9.5	

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--three counties of the 56 having agricultural divisions.

---

[1] One of the 43 counties reporting time devoted to year-round farm labor gave no information on number of days worked.

[2] The basic estimate of workdays for extension agents was arrived at by subtracting 52 Saturdays, 52 Sundays, 22 days of vacation (one month) and seven holidays from 365 days. This gives 232 as the number of workdays in a man-year.

[3] The data on workdays by counties are not entirely accurate in that agents on a particular county staff may carry work in other counties.

The mean number of days of input for the 53 counties was 7.5, and for the 42 which did some work was 9.5. Eleven, or 21 percent of the 53 counties gave no time to year-round farm labor; however, another 11 gave from 15 to 35 days of staff time to this activity.

The percent of total staff workdays devoted to work on year-round farm labor was calculated for each county.[1] The number and percentage distribution according to this percent for the 53 counties reporting is given in Table 4. The mean percent of staff time devoted to year-round farm labor for all 53 counties was 1.29, and for 42 counties doing some work in the area, 1.56. In only five counties did the staffs devote from 3.00 to 5.99 percent of their time to year-round farm labor.

Table 4

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According to Percent of Total Staff Time Devoted to Year-round Farm Labor (Exclusive of Training): 1966-67

Percent of total staff workdays	Counties	
	Number	Percent
None	11	21
0.10 - 0.99	18	34
1.00 - 1.99	11	21
2.00 - 2.99	8	15
3.00 - 3.99	3	5
4.00 - 4.99	1	2
5.00 - 5.99	1	2
Total	53[a]	100
Mean (including 0)		1.29
Mean (excluding 0)		1.56

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--three counties of the 56 having agricultural divisions.

---

[1] The number of staff members taking into account those taking leave (excluding sick leave) and length of employment in the county during 1966-67 was multiplied by 232 workdays to determine the base for this percent.

Of the three cooperative extension specialists who devoted time to year-round farm labor one gave one day to it; one, one and a half days; and one, two days.[1]

The mean number of days devoted to training exclusive of regional meetings of agents in the 54 counties reporting was 2.2, and in the 47 counties which had agents who received training was 2.5 (Table 5). In 54 percent of the 54 counties the number of days of training was two or less (excluding 0). On the other hand, in 33 percent of the counties from three to nine and one half days of training had been received by members of the staff.

Table 5

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According to Number of Training Days For Staff on Year-round Farm Labor[a]: 1966-67

Number of training days	Counties Number	Counties Percent
0	7	13
2 or less (exc. 0)	29	54
3 - 4	14	26
5+	4	7
Total	54[b]	100
Mean (including 0)	2.2	
Mean (excluding 0)	2.5	

[a] A small portion of this training was devoted to migrant farm labor.

[b] Not applicable or no agent--two counties of 56 having agricultural divisions.

---

[1] One of these was a vegetable specialist and the other two were poultry specialists.

Four of the cooperative extension specialists reported having received training (exclusive of regional meetings) on year-round farm labor for a total of four days.

The mean number of days (including training) devoted to year-round farm labor in the 53 counties reporting was 9.7 (Table 6). If only the 48 counties devoting time to either work or training or both are considered, the mean was 10.7. With training excluded the mean for the 53 counties reporting was 7.5 workdays and for the 42 counties actually doing some work on year-round farm labor, 9.5. Thus, including training time raises the averages for days of input to some extent.

Table 6

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According to Total Days of Staff Input Devoted to Year-round Farm Labor (Including Training): 1966-67

Total days of staff input including training	Counties Number	Counties Percent
None	5	9
.5	3	6
1 - 4	13	24
5 - 9	13	24
10 - 14	8	15
15 - 19	4	8
20 - 24	--	--
25 - 29	4	8
30 - 34	2	4
35 - 39	--	--
40 - 44	1	2
Total	53[a]	100
Mean (including 0)	9.7	
Mean (excluding 0)	10.7	

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--three counties of the 56 having agricultural divisions.

The mean percent of total staff workdays devoted to year-round farm labor when training days are added to workdays was

1.66 for the 53 counties reporting, and 1.82 for the 48 counties either doing work, or receiving training, or both (Table 7). When days of training were excluded, the mean percent for the 53 counties reporting was 1.29 and for the 42 counties doing some work on year-round farm labor was 1.56. Thus, training added from .26 to .37 percentage points to the average days of input on year-round farm labor.

Table 7

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According to Percent of Total Staff Time Devoted to Year-round Farm Labor (Including Training): 1966-67

Percent of total staff workdays	Counties	
	Number	Percent
None	5	9
0.10 - 0.99	18	34
1.00 - 1.99	15	29
2.00 - 2.99	5	9
3.00 - 3.99	7	13
4.00 - 4.99	1	2
5.00 - 5.99	2	4
Total	53[a]	100
Mean (including 0)	1.66	
Mean (excluding 0)	1.82	

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--three counties of the 56 having agricultural divisions.

Meetings on year-round farm labor and other labor activities. Of the 43 counties that gave time to year-round farm labor, 25 held one or more meetings which were specifically devoted to this matter. The mean number of meetings held by these 25 counties was 2.4 (Table 8). Almost two thirds of the 25 counties held only one meeting; however, five had held four meetings; two, six; and one, eight.

Four cooperative extension specialists reported some time given to year-round farm labor. One of them had held one meeting specifically devoted to this matter.

Table 8

Number and Percentage Distribution Of Counties Holding One or More Meetings Devoted Specifically to Year-round Farm Labor According to Number of Meetings Held: 1966-67

Number of meetings held	Counties Number	Counties Percent
1	15	60
2	2	8
3	--	--
4	5	20
5	--	--
6	2	8
7	--	--
8	1	4
Total	25	100
Mean	2.4	

For 39 of the meetings both attendance and agreed-to-attend were reported. The total number of attendances at the 39 meetings was 728 or an average (mean) of 18.7 persons per meeting. For these same 39 meetings there was a total of 734 agreed-to attendances, or an average of 18.8 persons per meeting who had agreed to attend. Thus the level of attendance was generally almost identical with what the agents had anticipated as a result of farmers promising to attend.[1] For 12 of the 39 meetings attendance exceeded the agreed-to-attend number, for 24 it was less, and for three the same. One cooperative extension specialist reported that for one meeting he had 25 agree to attend with 20 actually attending. In addition to these 40 meetings attendance was also reported on 13 other meetings. The total number of attendances at these 53 meetings was 1,303, or 24.6 persons per meeting.

---

[1] The numbers for agreed-to-attend in the case of a series of meetings were usually the same for each meeting. For each series this number constituted those who had agreed to participate before the meetings started.

The topics considered at the meetings devoted specifically to year-round farm labor covered a fairly wide range. A list of the topics, accompanied by number of meetings at which each was used follows:

	Topics	Number of meetings
1.	Work incentives or work schedules, or work incentives and motivations	8
2.	Compensation, or salary and fringe benefits	8
3.	Dairy farm labor	5
4.	Management problems and practices	5
5.	Perceptions and attitudes	5
6.	General discussion of labor	4
7.	Labor discussion by L. C. Cunningham, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University	2
8.	Problems of labor management	2
9.	Training or instructing	2
10.	Background problems and examples of some solutions being used	1
11.	Case studies of farm labor management	1
12.	Dealing with hired help on farm	1
13.	Federal minimum wage, State employment law, Workmen's Compensation	1
14.	Frames of reference in personnel management--basis for communication	1
15.	General farm labor relations and management	1
16.	Job breakdown	1
17.	Job instruction determined major problems	1
18.	Labor agreement	1
19.	Look at worker, employer, and labor camp	1
20.	Major approaches to labor problems	1
21.	Practices and privileges	1
22.	Results of employment survey and current farm labor legislation	1
23.	Study report by L. C. Cunningham, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University	1
24.	Supervision	1
	Total	56

Altogether 24 different topics or groups of topics were reported for 56 meetings. The two topics or groups of topics which appear most frequently are: work incentives or work schedules, or work incentives and motivations (8); and compensation, or salary and fringe benefits (8).

The respondents also listed the leaders or teachers who were used at the meetings devoted specifically to year-round farm labor. A county agricultural agent or agents provided the leadership at 30 of the 55 meetings on which reports were made. In seven other meetings they shared leadership with others. Other classes of leaders or teachers serving at more than one meeting were professors of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University, 10 meetings; a Civil Service job instructor, four meetings; and a representative of I. & L.R. School, Cornell University, four meetings. The following tabulation presents the leaders or combinations of leaders reported:

Leaders or combinations of leaders at meetings devoted specifically to year-round farm labor	Number of meetings
1. N. Y. Cooperative Extension Agent, Agriculture (one agent at each meeting)	23
2. Professor of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University	10
3. N. Y. Cooperative Extension Agents, Agriculture (two or more agents at each meeting)	7
4. Civil Service job instructor	4
5. N. Y. Cooperative Extension Agent and Representative of I. & L.R. School, Cornell University	4
6. N. Y. Cooperative Extension Agent and N.Y.S. Employment Service--Farm Labor Representative	1
7. N. Y. Cooperative Extension Agent and Professor of Social Science, Colgate University	1
8. N. Y. Cooperative Extension Agent, Assistant Director of N. Y. Cooperative Extension, Professor of I. & L.R. School, Cornell University, and Representative from Employment Service	1
9. Professor of Extension Education, Cornell University	1

Leaders or combinations of leaders at meetings devoted specifically to year-round farm labor	Number of meetings
10. Professor of I. & L.R. School, Cornell University	1
11. Representative of Manpower and Development Center, Rochester; Professor of I. & L.R. School, Cornell University; Supervisor of Development and Training, R. T. French Co.; Representative of State Labor Department	1
12. Representative of U.S. Department of Labor, Buffalo and Representative of Division of Labor Standards, Albany	1
Total	55.

In addition to the meetings devoted specifically to year-round farm labor which 25 counties reported, 50 counties reported doing one or more of the following farm labor (year-round, migrant, or both) activities:

	Number of counties
Held general meetings on farm labor.	12
Gave TV and/or radio programs.	20
Wrote newsletters or letters on farm labor	34
Carried articles on farm labor in County News. . .	48
Prepared articles on farm labor for newspapers, magazines, or journals	7
Other.	8[1]

---

[1] Other included:

(1) Included topic on labor laws at winter vegetable growers school
(2) Individual counseling
(3) Prepared Farm Labor Guide for distribution and organized Farm Labor Study Committee
(4) Spoke at Steuben Co. Dairy Banquet on farm labor management
(5) Worked with N.Y.S. Employment Service (two counties)
(6) Attended several meetings of Suffolk Human Relations Commision with ex-migrants and seasonal workers
(7) Personal visits and consulting

Mass media, i.e., County News, newsletters, and TV and/or radio, are certainly widely accepted by the agents as a means of informing and teaching farm operators concerning farm labor matters.

One cooperative extension specialist reported writing newsletters or letters on year-round farm labor.

Agents' evaluation of participants' reactions to meetings. The agents were asked to evaluate their meetings which dealt specifically with year-round farm labor. The evaluation involved three areas, i.e., participation, general reaction at end of meeting or meetings, and interest in continuing such discussions. Their evaluations are summarized below:

	Agents	
Participation	Number	Percent
All contributed to discussion	11	42
Most contributed to discussion	6	23
Some contributed to discussion	7	27
Only a few contributed to discussion	2	8
Total	26	100
General reaction at end of meeting or meetings		
Most were favorable	21	81
Some were favorable	4	15
Few were favorable	1	4
Total	26	100
Interest in continuing such discussions		
Most were	17	63
Some were	8	30
Few were	2	7
Total	27	100

Generally, the agents seemed to think the farmers received the meetings very well. Sixty-five percent thought that most or all of those attending participated. Eighty-one percent felt that the general reaction of most was favorable and 63 percent thought that most were interested in continuing such discussions. The cooperative extension specialist who held one year-round farm labor meeting reported that most of those who attended participated, most were favorable, and some were interested in continuing.

Evaluation of farm labor material sent to agents. The chairman of the College Committee on Farm Labor sent to agents four publications for their use in their farm labor activities. Table 9 presents the agents' evaluation of these publications.

For three of the publications the number of agents who could not recall receiving them was sizable, ranging from 10 to 18 out of 41 (or 40). Also for three of them the number recalling receiving but not using was rather large, ranging from 11 to 13 out of 41 (or 40). The numbers actually evaluating the publications were relatively small, ranging from 10 to 24. For two of the publications the percentages considering them very useful were 32 and 29. These two publications were: Human Relations on Dairy Farms and Six Case Studies on Dairy, Fruit, Vegetable, and Poultry Farms. The other two publications were rated very useful by 18 and 10 percent of those rating them.

Four of the cooperative extension specialists reported not remembering receiving, two recalled receiving two or more but did not use, and six gave no information.[1]

---

[1] Another of these specialists who was a leader of the agricultural division in a county for most of the 1966-67 period was classified with the county agents on these data.

Table 9

Evaluation and Disposition of Publications on Farm Labor Sent to Agents By Chairman of College Committee on Farm Labor

Title of publication	Don't recall receiving	Received but never used	Read but never used	Saved for future	Very useful		Some use		Little use		Total used		Grand total
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
1) The Countdown on Farm Labor by D. W. Sturt	14	13	1	1	2	18	7	64	2	18	11	100	40[a]
2) The Application of Industrial and Public Sector Labor-Management Practices to the Problems of Farm Labor by Charles T. Schmidt	18	11	1	1	1	10	8	80	1	10	10	100	41
3) Six Case Studies on Dairy, Fruit, Vegetable and Poultry Farms by L. Adams, B. How, and O. Larson	3	12	1	1	7	29	16	67	1	4	24	100	41
4) Human Relations on Dairy Farms by Charles W. Given and James R. Hundley, Jr.	10	7	1	1	7	32	14	63	1	5	22	100	41

[a] One agent gave information on other three publications but did not on this one.

Year-round Farm Labor Program: 1967-68

Commitment to year-round farm labor program. The following tabulation gives the position of the 53 counties reporting regarding plans to devote time to year-round farm labor in 1967-68.

Devote time to	Counties Number	Counties Percent
Yes	44	83
Uncertain	4	8
No	5	9
Total	53[1]	100

Over four fifths of the 53 counties indicated they would devote time to year-round farm labor. Five counties were negative and four were uncertain.

Of the 13 cooperative extension specialists three indicated they would devote some time to year-round farm labor, five were uncertain, and five indicated they would not devote any time to this area.

Potential participants for meetings. The division leaders who indicated their staffs would devote time to year-round farm labor in 1967-68 were asked to estimate the number of farmers whom they thought could be interested in meetings devoted specifically to the topic of year-round farm labor. Two opportunities for answering the question were given, i.e., 1) for those already having had meetings, and 2) for those planning meetings for the first time. Twenty-one counties which had already had meetings reported that a total of 748 farmers could be interested, or a mean number per county of 35.6 (Table 10). The 22 counties which were planning meetings for the first time reported a possible total of 589, or a mean number per county of 26.8 (Table 11). The estimated total number of potential participants for the 43 counties was 1,337, or 31.1 persons per county.[1]

---

[1] Two counties had no agricultural agent and a third county had contracted its commercial agriculture program to an adjoining county.

Only one cooperative extension specialist reported on this item, and he estimated 25 farmers might be interested.

Table 10

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According to Number of Farm Operators Who Could Be Interested In Some New Meetings Devoted Specifically to Farm Labor: 1967-68

Number of farmers	Counties	
	Number	Percent
10 - 14	3	14
15 - 19	2	10
20 - 24	2	10
25 - 29	3	14
30 - 34	3	14
35 - 39	1	5
40 - 44	1	5
45 - 49	--	--
50 - 54	3	14
55 - 59	--	--
60 - 64	1	5
65 - 69	1	5
125	1	5
Total	21	101[a]
Mean	35.6	

[a] This total of 101 percent resulted from rounding.

---

[1] Forty-four counties reported that they would devote time to year-round farm labor in 1967-68, but 43 reported on potential participants for meetings.

Table 11

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According To Estimated Number of Farm Operators Who Could Be Interested In Some Initial Meetings Devoted Specifically to Farm Labor: 1967-68

Number of farmers	Counties	
	Number	Percent
10 - 14	4	18
15 - 19	2	9
20 - 24	5	22
25 - 29	5	22
30 - 34	1	5
35 - 39	3	14
40 - 44	--	--
45 - 49	--	--
50 - 54	1	5
100	1	5
Total	22	100
Mean	26.8	

Staff input. Of the 40 counties which expected to do work on year-round farm labor in 1967-68, and which reported, 10, or 25 percent indicated that from three to six staff members would devote time to this activity (Table 12). The mean number for the 40 counties was 2.0. In 1966-67 the mean number who actually devoted time to this activity was also 2.0 (for 43 counties). A total of 80 agents from 40 counties were expected to give time to the activity in 1967-68; in 1966-67, 84 agents from 43 counties devoted time to this work.[1]

Thirty-four of the counties reporting and planning to do some work on year-round farm labor indicated the number of days that the agent staff would devote to year-round farm labor in 1967-68. The mean number of days for all 34 counties was 14.7 (Table 13). In 1966-67, the mean exclusive of training for all the 42 counties reporting some time for year-round farm labor was 9.5 days. Thus, on the average the plans of the counties call for an increase in workdays of the program in 1967-68 over 1966-67. Ten, or 30 percent, of the 34 counties expected to devote 20 or more days to year-round farm labor. One of these 10 counties planned to give 54 days to this activity.

---

[1] See Appendix E for list of agents by counties who were expected to devote time to year-round farm labor in 1967-68.

Three cooperative extension specialists said they would devote some time to year-round farm labor in 1967-68. Of these three, two planned to give four days and one, five.[1]

Table 12

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties Expecting To Do Year-round Farm Labor Work According to Number of Agents Who Would Devote Time to This Activity: 1967-68

Number of agents	Counties	
	Number	Percent
1	16	40
2	14	35
3	7	17.5
4	1	2.5
5	1	2.5
6	1	2.5
Total	40[a]	100
Mean	2.0	

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--16 counties of the 56 having agricultural divisions.

The total number of workdays exclusive of training which the 34 counties reporting some expected time on year-round farm labor planned to devote to this activity in 1967-68 was 499.5 (2.2 man-years; in 1966-67, the total number of days for the 42 counties reporting some time was 399 (1.7 man-years).

---

[1] One of these was a horticultural specialist and the other two were poultry specialists.

Table 13

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties Expecting to Do Year-round Farm Labor Work (Excluding Days of Training) According to Number of Workdays That Would Be Devoted to This Activity: 1967-68

Number of workdays	Counties	
	Number	Percent
1 - 4	4	12
5 - 9	10	29
10 - 14	6	17
15 - 19	4	12
20 - 24	2	6
25 - 29	5	15
30 - 34	2	6
35 - 39	--	--
40 - 44	--	--
45 - 49	--	--
50 - 54	1	3
Total	34[a]	100
Mean	14.7	

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--22 counties of the 56 having agricultural divisions.

The mean number of agents per county who should receive training for 1967-68 as indicated by the divisional leaders in the 37 counties planning to do year-round farm labor work and reporting was 1.8 (Table 14). Eight counties, or 22 percent, of the 37 counties indicated that from three to six members of their staffs should have training in 1967-68.

Seven counties, or 19 percent, of the 36 reporting and planning to do work on year-round farm labor indicated that their agents should receive from six to 12 days of training in 1967-68 (Table 15).

Table 14

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties Planning To Do Year-round Farm Labor Work According to Number of Agents Who Should Receive Training: 1967-68

Number of agents	Counties Number	Counties Percent
0	1	3
1	19	51
2	9	24
3	6	16
4	1	3
5	--	--
6	1	3
Total	37[a]	100
Mean	1.8	

---

[a] No information, no agent, not applicable, no program planned, or uncertain about a program--19 counties of the 56 having agricultural divisions.

Table 15

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties Planning to Do Year-round Farm Labor Work According To Number of Days of Training Staffs Should Receive: 1967-68

Number of days	Counties Number	Counties Percent
0	1	3
1 - 2	13	36
3 - 4	15	42
5 - 12	7	19
Total	36[a]	100
Mean	3.6	

---

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--20 counties out of the 56 having agricultural divisions.

The mean number of days of training per county which was indicated that the staff should receive was 3.6. This training would involve a total of 65 agents for an average of 2.0 days per agent. In 1966-67 the mean number of days of training received per county exclusive of regional meetings was 2.2 (includes 0's)[1] and involved 90 agents for an average of 1.3 days per agent. Thus, the amount of training which it was thought agents should receive in 1967-68 was somewhat above that received in 1966-67, both on a per county and per agent basis.[2]

One cooperative extension specialist wanted one day of training and two wanted two days.

Eleven, or 33 percent of the 33 counties reporting and indicating some work would be done on year-round farm labor in 1967-68 indicated that from 20 to 60 days of input including training would be given to this activity (Table 16). The mean number of days per county that would be thus used was 18.3. In 1966-67, 48 counties reported doing work (including training) in this area for an average of 10.7 days per county. Thus, while a smaller number of counties reported and indicated they would do work on year-round farm labor in 1967-68, their average days of input would be considerably higher than in 1966-67. It is, of course, possible that those counties not reporting or not planning to do work in 1967-68 were counties with relatively small inputs in 1966-67.

Assistance expected of college staff. The mean number of days of assistance which the 38 counties reporting and planning year-round farm labor work wanted from the college extension staff was 2.5 (Table 17). Thirteen counties, or 35 percent, of the 38 counties indicated from three to eight days of this kind of assistance. Two cooperative extension specialists wanted one day of assistance from the college extension staff and one wanted two days.

---

[1] This mean with zero cases included was considered the more appropriate average to use for this comparison.

[2] Agents received some training at their regional meetings in 1966-67 which was excluded in the averages for that year. However, it is doubtful that this exclusion affects the comparison since it is practically certain that the training which was indicated they should receive in 1967-68 did not include the regional meetings.

Table 16

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties Planning to Do Year-round Farm Labor Work According to Total Number of Work Days Expect to Devote to This Activity (Including Days of Training): 1967-68

Number of days	Counties	
	Number	Percent
1 - 4	1	3
5 - 9	9	28
10 - 14	7	21
15 - 19	5	15
20 - 24	3	9
25 - 29	2	6
30 - 34	3	9
35 - 39	2	6
60	1	3
Total	33[a]	100
Mean	18.3	

---

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--23 counties out of 56 having agricultural divisions.

Table 17

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties Planning to Do Year-round Farm Labor Work in 1967-68 According to Number of Days Agricultural College Extension Staff Members Could Be Used in County

No. of days college extension staff could be used in county	Counties	
	Number	Percent
None	2	5
1 - 2	23	60
3 - 4	8	21
5 - 6	4	11
7 - 8	1	3
Total	38[a]	100
Mean	2.5	

---

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--18 counties out of the 56 having agricultural divisions.

The agent leader in the counties planning to do work on year-round farm labor in 1967-68 indicated for the college staff members whom they would like to use in their counties the following expectancies:

	Expectations of College Extension Staff	Number of counties
1.	Participate in county meetings	16
2.	Participate in county meetings and assist agents with program planning	6
3.	Staff training and county meetings	3
4.	Assist with planning program	3
5.	Consult with farm labor agencies and help evaluate labor situation	1
6.	Assist with planning county meetings and prepare service letters and news articles	1
7.	Consult on special problems with individuals	1
8.	Consult with staff and key farm operators and general meetings on labor management (possible series)	1
9.	Serve as a coordinator at college level (really not in-the-county function)	1
10.	Make farm visits to determine problem areas and conditions that help to keep good workers	1
11.	Help set up a multi-county labor program to screen and employ workers when needed by farmers	1
12.	General--not clear as to specific work expected:	
	a. Partnerships, special labor problems, possible training school	1
	b. Responsibility of farmer to employee, how to train for maintaining employer-employee relations, employment arrangements	1
	Total	37

Participation in county meetings leads the list with 16 counties wanting this kind of service. The actual number of counties wanting this kind of service when combinations with other functions are considered adds up to 26. Assisting with program planning in combination with participation in county meetings was the expectancy of six counties, three other counties wanted assistance with program planning, and another county asked for assistance in planning county meetings in combination with the preparation of service letters and news articles.

Three cooperative extension specialists--agriculture asked for the following services from the college extension staff: assistance in preparation of farm labor material, train specialist and present general topic at a meeting, and present material at meetings and possible personal counseling.

Migrant Farm Labor

While the major emphasis of this study is on year-round farm labor, some exploration was undertaken of activities directed to migrant farm labor.

Decisions of executive committees. The executive committees of eight of the 54 counties reporting[1] had discussed undertaking educational work on migrant farm labor. In five counties the executive committee had approved of the division's undertaking educational work in this area and in three counties no decision had been made. No cooperative extension specialist reported his advisory committee's having discussed this matter.

Work done and expected to be done on migrant farm labor. Eighteen of the 54 counties reporting[1] indicated that the agricultural division had done work on migrant farm labor in one or both of the past two years (1965-66 and 1966-67).[2]

---

[1] One county did not report because its commercial farming is serviced by the agricultural division of an adjoining county, and one county had no agricultural agent.

[2] Fourteen of these 18 counties reported that they had requests for information on migrant labor and that they were able to meet the requests.

These counties were:

Cayuga
Chautauqua
Columbia
Dutchess
Erie
Monroe
Niagara
Orange
Orleans
Oswego
Putnam
Seneca
Steuben
Suffolk
Ulster
Wayne
Westchester
Wyoming

Thirteen additional counties indicated that there was little or no migrant farm labor involved in their agriculture.

The mean number of days of input on migrant farm labor of the 14 counties doing some work in the field and reporting was 3.8 in 1965-66 and 4.9 for the 15 counties having done some work in 1966-67 and reporting. The range of days of input in 1965-66 was from one to 10, and in 1966-67 from one to 18. One cooperative extension specialist reported some consulting activity on migrant labor but did not report the time devoted to it.

Eighteen counties which had done work on migrant farm labor in either 1965-66 or 1966-67 or both years indicated some of the activities in which the agricultural staff had participated. A list of these activities follows with the number of counties reporting each activity:

Activities	Number of counties[1]
Worked with other agencies	7
Counseled with individual farmers	6
Worked with a migrant labor committee	4
Conducted meetings to review regulations	2
Cooperated with others in holding meetings	2
Prepared letters on seasonal or migrant labor	2
Worked with farmer organization	1
Helped form county migrant labor advisory committee	1

---

[1] A county may be counted more than once since it may have reported more than one activity in terms of the classes of activities listed.

Activities	Number of counties
Worked with Human Relations Committee	1
Helped a community in its deliberations on a migrant labor camp	1
Trained farm labor	1
Helped explain migrant labor situation as it pertained to sugar beets	1
Gave tips on handling labor at field meetings	1
News releases on seasonal or migrant labor	1
Set up information centers on seasonal labor	1
Held annual seasonal labor conference	1
Worked with VISTA program	1

Genesee County, which had not done any work on migrant farm labor in the past two years but indicated an interest in undertaking activity in this area, proposed working with farm operators to create understanding particularly on housing and incentives for these laborers. Eight other counties doing no work in this area didn't know about the future.[1]

Information on migrant farm labor. The leaders of the agricultural divisions were asked whether or not requests were made of the divisions with regard to government policy, law, and regulations relating to migrant farm labor. Thirty of 54 counties[2] indicated that such requests were made. Twenty-four of the counties indicated that they had the required information.[3] Two of the cooperative extension specialists also indicated they had received this kind of request for information and that they had the required information.

---

[1] No information was obtained on expected input on migrant labor in 1967-68.

[2] One county did not report because its commercial agriculture is serviced by the agricultural division of an adjoining county and one county had no agricultural agent.

[3] Ten of these 24 counties evidently did not consider meeting these requests to be a part of their migrant farm labor input since they reported no work on migrant labor.

The divisional leaders as well as the extension specialists were also asked to indicate the sources from which they obtained their information. The following sources were mentioned:

By divisional leaders

New York State Department of Labor
New York State Employment Service
New York State Department of Health
County Health Departments
County Extension Files
College of Agriculture, Cornell University
Department of Agriculture and Markets
Cornell University bulletins
Social Security
State Police
Farm Bureau
Motor Vehicles Bureau

By a cooperative extension specialist

Federal CAP Handbook

Labor Relations of Nursery, Landscape, and Garden Center Operators[1]

Current and future activities. Fifty-three counties reported on activity in this area. The following tabulation presents the status of their operations and interests.

---

[1] No information on this type of work was sought from the cooperative extension specialists.

	Number of counties
No activities in 1966-67 or in the future	30[1]
No activities in 1966-67 and uncertain about future activities	8
Some activities in 1966-67 and will continue some or all	8[2]
No activities in 1966-67 but interested in future activities	7
Total	53[3]

The eight counties which reported activities in 1966-67 and expected to continue working in this area in the future were:

Chemung
Monroe
Nassau
Niagara
Onondaga
Schenectady
Suffolk
Westchester

The seven counties which reported no activities in 1966-67, but an interest in future work were:

Broome
Erie[4]
Essex
Oneida
Orange
Saratoga
Wyoming

---

[1] One of these counties indicated a possible interest in work with agri-businesses other than nursery, landscape, and garden center operators in that such businesses as machinery dealers, feed dealers, and DHIC were asking for help. Another county indicated that nursery, landscape, and garden center operators were not excluded from information and recommendations released.

[2] Four of these counties also plan to add new activities in this field.

[3] Two counties had no agricultural agents and one county did not report as its commercial farming is serviced by the agricultural division of an adjoining county.

[4] Erie reported having done work in this field of labor before 1966-67.

The eight counties that reported labor activities with nursery, landscape, and garden center operators in 1966-67 indicated the following activities:

	Number of counties
Held general meetings with these operators, or in which they were included, at which labor relations were considered	5
Articles on their labor relations problems carried in County News	5
Written newsletters on their labor relations problems	4
Written newspaper, magazine, or journal articles on their labor relations problems	2
Given TV, radio, or both kinds of programs dealing with their labor relations problems	1
Held specific meetings on labor relations problems with these operators, or in which they were included	1
Other (counseling, work of regional cooperative extension specialists in county)	3

The number of man-days of staff input on the labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators for the eight counties doing work in this area in 1966-67 was as follows:

	Number of man-days[1]
Monroe	10
Westchester	10
Niagara	6
Chemung	3
Suffolk	2.5
Nassau	2
Onondaga	2
Schenectady	1
Total	36.5

---

[1] These estimates of input may be inaccurate in some instances because of the difficulty of separating year-round farm labor input from that devoted to this kind of labor activity.

According to this tabulation the eight counties devoted a total of 36.5 man-days to work on the labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators.[1]

Of the four counties which, in addition to activities in 1966-67, planned new activities, three indicated what these activities might be. Their proposals were:

1. Advising prospective employers of horticulture labor to encourage organized group effort to present local community college administrators with the need and employment opportunities available to student upon completion of a general horticulture curriculum which hopefully might be initiated at the community college
2. A basic course on effective communication
3. Have farm labor discussed as a topic at flower growers, nursery, garden supply dealer, potato and vegetable meetings.

The seven counties which had never done any work with nursery, landscape, and garden center operators on labor problems, but which expected to do something in the future indicated the following possible activities:

1. Conference of these operators to determine their needs
2. Circulars and meetings
3. Information on broad scale for those employing year-round labor--all types of employers
4. Incorporate information into meetings planned for this group on subject matter; use service letters and news articles as reminders
5. Possibly a school similar to that held for agriculture
6. If we employ an ornamental horticulturist, he will be interested in this program
7. Visit the nurseryman with a specialist to learn their problems and needs

---

[1] No information was obtained on expected input on labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators.

The eight counties which reported work in this area in 1966-67 and the seven which indicated an interest in this kind of work in the future estimated the amount of extension staff time of the College of Agriculture and of staff time of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations needed by the county in 1967-68. The estimates for the 15 counties are presented below:

	Number of staff days could use in county	
	College of Agriculture	School of Industrial and Labor Relations
Broome	1	--
Chemung	uncertain	uncertain
Erie	1	1
Essex	--	2
Monroe	--	--
Nassau	--	1
Niagara	8	8
Oneida	1	1
Onondaga	1	--
Orange	2	2
Saratoga	1	1
Schenectady	1	1
Suffolk	3	2
Westchester	4	--
Wyoming	--	1
Total	23	20

The 15 counties gave an estimated need of 23 man-days from the staff of the College of Agriculture and 20 man-days from that of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations. A total of 43 man-days of the staffs of the two institutions was projected.[1]

Total Input of County Staffs on Labor

The total man-days devoted to labor activities including training by county staffs was calculated for 1966-67. This amounted to 630.5 man-days, or 2.7 man-years, for the 53 counties reporting. The mean number of man-days of input per county was 11.9 (Table 18). Eleven counties, or 21 percent of the 53 counties devoted 20 or more days to labor activities. The range was from zero to 62.5 days. One county reported 41 days; one, 50, and another, 62.5.[1]

---

[1] See Appendix F for labor activities mentioned in county programs and plans of work for 1967-68.

Table 18

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According to Total Man-Days of Input On Labor Activities, Including Year-round Farm Labor, Migrant Labor, and Nursery, Landscape, and Garden Center Labor, and Training on Labor: 1966-67

Number of man-days	Counties Number	Counties Percent
None	3	6
Under 5 (exc. 0)	16	30
5 - 9	14	26
10 - 14	7	13
15 - 19	2	4
20 - 24	4	7
25 - 29	2	4
30 - 34	1	2
35 - 39	1	2
41+	3	6
Total	53[a]	100
Mean	11.9	

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--three of the 56 counties having agricultural divisions.

For the 53 counties reporting the mean percent of total staff workdays devoted to all labor activities including training was 2.05 (Table 19). Thirteen counties, or 25 percent of the total devoted from 3.02 to 5.93 days to labor matters. Only three counties did no work on labor.[1]

---

[1] No total calculation was made for estimated input for 1967-68 because the required information was not obtained on either migrant or nursery, landscape, and garden center labor.

Table 19

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According to Percent of Total Staff Time Devoted to Year-round Farm Labor, Migrant Labor, Nursery-Landscape-Garden Center Labor Including Training on Labor: 1966-67

Percent of total staff workdays	Counties	
	Number	Percent
None	3	6
0.10 - 0.99	15	28
1.00 - 1.99	18	34
2.00 - 2.99	4	8
3.00 - 3.99	7	13
4.00 - 4.99	2	4
5.00 - 5.99	4	8
Total	53[a]	101[b]
Mean	2.05	

[a] No information, no agent, or not applicable--three of the 56 counties having agricultural divisions.

[b] This total of 101 percent resulted from rounding.

Departmental Extension Staff in College of Agriculture

Returns from Departmental Extension Leaders

Questionnaires or reports relative to questionnaires were obtained from the 15 department leaders, the leader of Consumer Education, and the extension staff member in the Veterinary College.

---

[1] See Appendix G for relationship of staff input on labor to total staff time.

Input on Year-round Farm Labor[1]

Seven department leaders, the leader of Consumer Education, and the extension staff member of the Veterinary College reported no work or anticipated work in this area.[2] The man-days of input for eight departments reporting work on year-round farm labor for 1966-67 is recorded in Table 20.[3]

The total number of man-days reported by the eight departments was 309.5. If this figure is converted to man-years using 232 days of work as a man-year, the total input of the extension staff of the eight departments was 1.33 man-years. The three departmental extension staffs which contributed the highest percentages of man-days out of the total of 309.5 were Animal Science (30 percent), Agricultural Economics (21 percent), and Conservation (20 percent).

Of the seven kinds of activities on which the extension leaders reported, talks or discussion leadership for special groups had the largest number of man-days of input, 141, or 46 percent of the total of 309.5. Preparation of bulletins, leaflets, and mimeographs was second with 66 man-days, or 21 percent of the total. In third place was training of agents with 38 man-days, or 12 percent of the total. Agricultural Economics and Animal Science were in first and second position for man-days of input on talks or discussion leadership for special groups. Conservation, Animal Science, and Agricultural Economics made the major contributions for preparation of bulletins, leaflets, and mimeographs. Animal Science and Agricultural Economics made the major contributions to training of agents. Animal Science devoted 10 man-days to administration of the program which was largely the result of one staff member serving as chairman of the College Farm Labor Committee.

---

[1] Year-round farm labor should be interpreted broadly for the college extension staff because in the case of at least one department, i.e., Floriculture and Ornamental Horticulture, it refers to work on labor relations of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators.

[2] Four of these departments indicated that while no direct work was done on farm labor, their activities indirectly touched on it.

[3] See Appendix H for list of college extension staff members who devoted time to year-round farm labor in 1966-67.

Table 21 presents by departments the number of staff members working on year-round farm labor and their time input for this activity. The number of staff members devoting time to year-round farm labor ranged from two to seven. A total of 31 different members did some work in the area. Agricultural Engineering reported seven members and Agricultural Economics, six. Rural Sociology and Vegetable Crops each reported two members.

For those departmental staffs doing year-round farm labor work, 5.9 percent of their extension time was devoted to this activity. Animal Science and Agricultural Economics had the highest percentages, 18.4 and 9.2 respectively. The percent of their total extension time which was devoted to year-round farm labor in 1966-67 by all eight departmental staffs was 2.0. Conservation and Animal Science had the highest percentages, 4.1 and 4.0 respectively.

Table 20

Number of Man-Days of Work on Various Phases of Year-round Farm Labor By Staff Members of Departments of College of Agriculture: 1966-67

	Number of man-days of work on various phases of year-round farm labor								
Departments	Training of agents--include prep. time	Adminis-tration of program activities	Writing articles for newspapers, journals, etc.	Writing articles for County News	Preparing bulletins, leaflets, mimeos	Radio or TV presen-tations--include preparation time	Talks or discussion leadership for special groups, farmers, floricul-turalists, etc.--include preparation time	Total man-days No.	Total man-days %
Agr. Economics	13	--	--	1	16	--	36	66	21
Agr. Engineering	1	--	2	2	3	--	22	30	10
Animal Science	17	10	5	7	18	2	35	94	30
Communication Arts	--	1.5	2	1	--	2	--	6.5	2
Conservation	--	5	1	6	20	7	23	62	20
Floriculture & Orn. Horticulture	1	1	--	--	3	--	19	24	8
Rural Sociology	5	3	--	--	6	--	1	15	5
Vegetable Crops	1	6	--	--	--	--	5	12	4
Total	38	26.5	10	17	66	11	141	309.5	
Percent	12	9	3	5	21	4	46		100

Table 21

Number of Staff Members Working on Year-round Farm Labor and Their Time Input, by Departments of College of Agriculture: 1966-67[a]

Departments	(1) Number of staff members involved	(2) Number of man-days of work on year-round farm labor	(3) Number of total extension man-days of those doing work on year-round farm labor	(4) Total number of extension man-years for those doing work on year-round farm labor	(5) Percent of total extension time devoted to year-round farm labor by staff members doing this work	(6) Total number of extension man-years of department staff[b]	(7) Percent of total extension staff time devoted to year-round farm labor
Agr. Economics	6	66.0	719.2	3.10	9.2	15.03	1.9
Agr. Engineering	7	30.0	1,488.6	6.42	2.0	8.42	1.5
Animal Science	3	94.0	510.4	2.20	18.4	10.07	4.0
Communication Arts	4	6.5	846.8	3.65	.8	12.92	.2
Conservation	4	62.0	850.7	3.67	7.3	6.47	4.1
Floriculture & Orn. Horticulture	3	24.0	336.4	1.45	7.1	6.47	1.6
Rural Sociology	2	15.0	255.2	1.10	5.9	4.20	1.5
Vegetable Crops	2	12.0	266.8	1.15	4.5	4.22	1.2
Total	31	309.5	5,274.1	22.73		67.80	
Mean					5.9		2.0

---

[a] Columns (3), (4), and (6) are presented to provide information on the bases used for calculating percentages and man-years.

[b] Number of man-days used to determine a man-year was 232. See footnote 2, page 30.

Estimated Man-Years Needed for the Period 1967 to 1970

Of the eight departments interested in work on year-round farm labor, only seven gave estimates for the three fiscal years from 1967 to 1970 (Table 21). The Conservation Department which devoted .27 man-years to this activity in 1966-67 estimated no man-years for the next three fiscal years. Communication Arts gave no estimates, indicating that "it depends." Five of the six departments making estimates indicated increases in 1967-68 over their 1966-67 input. The sixth department indicated its first increase over 1966-67 in 1968-69. Four of the departments estimating an increase for 1967-68 over 1966-67, made no additional increases in either 1968-69 or 1969-70. The other two departments giving estimates raised their estimate in 1968-69 but made no further increase in 1969-70. As noted previously, one of these departments made its first increase in 1968-69. For the seven departments making future estimates the total number of man-years of actual input for 1966-67 was 1.30.[1] The total estimated for 1967-68 rose to 1.87, in 1968-69 to 2.22, and remained at 2.22 for 1969-70.

Estimates for salary costs for the three fiscal periods from 1967 to 1970 were made by only five departments. These estimates are presented in the following tabulation:

	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
Agricultural Economics	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000
Agricultural Engineering	2,500	2,500	2,500
Animal Science	10,000	10,000	10,000
Floriculture & Orn. Horticulture	1,250	2,700	3,000
Rural Sociology	4,000	8,000	8,000

---

[1] The total for the eight departments in 1966-67 was 1.33 man-years.

Since not all departments interested in the activity gave estimates, the preceding figures can only be taken as suggestions of possible salary costs.

Table 22

Estimated Number of Man-Years Needed for Year-round Farm Labor by Departments Interested in This Activity For 1967-68, 1968-69, and 1969-70 with Comparison To Man-Years of Input in 1966-67

	No. of man-years devoted to year-round farm labor 1966-67	Estimated number of man-years needed for year-round farm labor		
		1967-68	1968-69	1969-70
Agricultural Economics	.28	.75	.75	.75
Agricultural Engineering	.13	.17	.17	.17
Animal Science	.41	.50	.50	.50
Communication Arts	.03	(no estimate given)		
Conservation	.27	.00	.00	.00
Floriculture & Orn. Horticulture	.10	.10	.20	.20
Rural Sociology	.06	.25	.50	.50
Vegetable Crops	.05	.10	.10	.10
Total	1.33	1.87	2.22	2.22

Farm Labor Publications

The departmental extension leaders were asked to list publications on both year-round and migrant farm labor which had been completed in the period 1965-67 or which were in process or being planned. The list of these publications by departments follows:

Departmental Publications on Labor Completed--1965-67

Agricultural Economics

Bratton, C. A., Labor Practices on 71 Dairy Farms--Lewis County.

How, R. B., Seasonal Labor in New York 1965.

Agricultural Engineering

Foss, E. W., Hazardous Occupations in Agriculture.

Foss, E. W., Motivating Youth or Restrictions, Safety Training, and Employment.

Foss, E. W., Safety Handbook #3: Handbook for Wives of Woods Workers, N.Y.S. Woods Safety Council

Foss, E. W., Safety Handbook #4: Handbook for Operators of Tractor Skidders, N.Y.S. Woods Safety Council

Foss, E. W., Safety Handbook #5: Handbook for Operators of Log and Pulp Trucks, N.Y.S. Woods Safety Council

Foss, E. W., Safety Handbook #6: Handbook for Woods Workers, N.Y.S. Woods Safety Council

Foss, E. W., Statement on Hazardous Occupations Order in Agriculture, U. S. Department of Labor Hearings, May 18, 1967

Foss, E. W., Report of 49 Deaths in New York State from Agricultural Accidents, Agr. Engineering Extension Bulletin 367

Communication Arts

(No author given), Compensation Law Extends Coverage to Migrant Workers.

(No author given), Survey of Prevailing Wages for Seasonal Hired Labor.

(No author given), Use of Migrant Labor.

(No author given), Workmen's Compensation Is Extended to Farm Laborers.

Rural Sociology

Capener, H. R., The Challenge of Managing the Physical and Human Resources of Institutional Farms, Annual Conference Report of the National Association of Institutional Farm Supervisors, October 5-7, 1965.

Larson, O. F., Income and Welfare of Rural People--Agricultural Research Significant to Public Policy, Public Welfare and Community Improvement, Rural Sociology: 30, December, 1965.

LeRay, N. L. and Reeder, W. W., Ex-Farm Operators in a Low-Income Area, Dept. of Rural Sociology Bulletin 67-2, November, 1965.

Vegetable Crops

Isenberg, F. M., College Labor Committee Questionnaire, Sweet Corn Quality Conference 1966.

Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology

Worker-Management Relationships on Farms in New York State in 1966 (mimeographed report), Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., January, 1967.

Departmental Publications on Labor in Progress or Planned

Rural Sociology

Larson, O. F., Bulletin planned on migrant labor.

Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology

Adams, L. P., How, R. B., and Larson, O. F., Viable Farmer-Worker Relationships: A Study of Selected Cases in New York State in 1966 (Bulletin)

Nineteen publications dealing with labor have been produced, one was in process, and another was in the planning stage.

Contributions of the School of Industrial and Labor Relations

One professor has been very active in the Extension Farm Labor Program. He has devoted time to training as well as county meetings of farmers. Between 10 and 15 percent of his academic time has been given to this work during 1966-67. Another professor from the school has made three presentations on farm labor and a third one has made two such presentations. A district field representative of the school has given two days of his time to this activity.

APPENDIX A

COUNTY DATA ON LABOR ACTIVITIES

Table 1

County Data on Labor Activities

County	Total staff man-years (no. of agents): 1966-67	Year-round Farm Labor											Other and Total			
		No. of agts. devoting time to: 1966-67	No. of workdays (exc. train.) devoted to:1966-67	Percent of total staff time (exc. train.):1966-67	No. of agts. receiving training: 1966-67	No. of days of training 1966-67	Total workdays (inc. train.) devoted to: 1966-67	Percent of total staff time devoted to (inc. train.): 1966-67	No. of agts. expected to devote time to: 1967-68	No. of workdays (exc. train.) expected to devote to: 1967-68	No. of days of training wanted: 1967-68	Total workdays (inc. train.) expected to devote to: 1967-68	No. of workdays devoted to migrant labor: 1966-67	No. of workdays devoted to labor relations of nursery and landscape-garden center operators: 1966-67	Total workdays devoted to all kinds of labor (inc. train.): 1966-67	Percent of total staff time devoted to all kinds of labor (inc. train.): 1966-67
Albany	2.50	0	0	0	2	3	3	.52	2	5	4	9			3	.52
Allegany	2.00	1	1	.22	2	3	4	.86	1	4	2	6			4	.86
Broome	2.42	2	3	.53	1	2.5	5.5	.98	2	6	1	7			5.5	.98
Cattaraugus	2.00	0	0	0	1	4	4	.86	1	20	3	23			4	.86
Cayuga	4.00	3	27	2.91	1	2.5	29.5	3.18	2	25	3	28	3		32.5	3.50
Chautauqua	3.00	1	4	.57	3	3.5	7.5	1.08	3	16	3	19	2		9.5	1.36
Chemung	1.58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	x[a]	x	x		3	3	.82
Chenango	2.41	2	8	1.43	2	3	11	1.96	2	16	4	20			11	1.96
Clinton	2.96	1	2	.29	1	2.5	4.5	.66	0	0	0	0			4.5	.66
Columbia	3.00	3	3	.43	2	3	6	.86	1	5	1	6	3		9	1.29
Cortland	2.00	1	21	4.53	2	5.5	26.5	5.71	1	27.5	4	31.5			26.5	5.71
Delaware	2.09	1	5	1.03	1	2.5	7.5	1.55	2	10	4	14			7.5	1.55
Dutchess	2.21	1	1	.20	1	.5	1.5	.29	2	10	4	14	2		3.5	.68
Erie	6.00	6	8	.57	5	2.5	10.5	.75	5	x	12	x	4		14.5	1.04
Essex	.96	1	5	2.25	1	.5	5.5	2.48	0	0	0	0			5.5	2.48
Franklin	1.50	0	0	0	1	.5	.5	.14	1	7.5	4	11.5			.5	.14
Fulton	1.00	0	0	0	1	.5	.5	.22	x	x	x	x			.5	.22
Genesee	1.50	1	3	.86	2	2.5	5.5	1.58	1	15	3	18			5.5	1.58
Greene	1.08	1	2	.80	1	.5	2.5	1.00	1	7	1	8			2.5	1.00
Herkimer	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	x	x			0	0
Jefferson	3.00	2	3	.43	3	3.5	6.5	.93	3	x	x	x			6.5	.93
Lewis	2.00	2	11	2.37	2	3	14	3.02	1	x	x	x			14	3.02
Livingston	2.00	1	8	1.72	2	1	9	1.94	1	8	1	9			9	1.94
Madison	2.00	1	4	.86	1	2.5	6.5	1.40	1	7.5	2	9.5			6.5	1.40
Monroe	5.00	3	35	3.02	5	9.5	44.5	3.84	3	54	6	60		10	62.5	5.39
Montgomery	.96	No agent to report														
Nassau	5.83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		2	2	.15
Niagara	4.00	4	22	2.37	4	4	26	2.80	3	26	6	32	18	6	50	5.39
Oneida	4.00	4	8	.86	4	2	10	1.08	1	8.5	2	10.5			10	1.08
Onondaga	3.50	3	9	1.11	2	3	12	1.48	4	11	2	13		2	14	1.72

---

[a] x = No information

Table 1 (continued)

		Year-round Farm Labor											Other and Total			
County	Total staff man-years (no. of agents): 1966-67	No. of agts. devoting time to: 1966-67	No. of workdays (exc. train.) devoted to: 1966-67	Percent of total staff time (exc. train.): 1966-67	No. of agts. receiving training: 1966-67	No. of days of training 1966-67	Total workdays (inc. train.) devoted to: 1966-67	Percent of total staff time devoted to (inc. train.): 1966-67	No. of agts. expected to devote time to: 1967-68	No. of workdays (exc. train.) expected to devote to: 1967-68	No. of days of training wanted: 1967-68	Total workdays (inc. train.) expected to devote to: 1967-68	No. of workdays devoted to migrant labor: 1966-67	No. of workdays devoted to labor relations of nursery and landscape-garden center operators: 1966-67	Total workdays devoted to all kinds of labor (inc. train.): 1966-67	Percent of total staff time devoted to all kinds of labor (inc. train.): 1966-67
Ontario	3.00	1	4	.57	1	2.5	6.5	.93	1	7	2	9			6.5	.93
Orange	4.00	3	12	1.29	1	2.5	14.5	1.56	2	10	1	11	0		14.5	1.56
Orleans	2.00	2	9	1.94	2	5	14	3.02	2	12	7	19	9		23	4.96
Oswego	2.12	0	0	0	1	2.5	2.5	.51	x[a]	?[b]	x	?	3		5.5	1.12
Otsego	3.00	1	3.5	.50	1	2	5.5	.79	x	?	x	?			5.5	.79
Putnam	1.00	1	1	.43	1	.5	1.5	.65	x	?	x	?	1		2.5	1.08
Rensselaer	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	10	35			0	0
Rockland	2.73	Not applicable														
St. Lawrence	4.00	4	16	1.72	4	2	18	1.94	3	13.5	6	19.5			18	1.94
Saratoga	2.00	2	25	5.39	2	2.5	27.5	5.93	2	25	4	29			27.5	5.93
Schenectady	2.00	0	0	0	1	.5	.5	.11	0	0	0	0		1	1.5	.32
Schoharie	.75	1	3	1.72	1	.5	3.5	2.01	-[c]	-	-	-			3.5	2.01
Schuyler	2.00	2	15	3.23	2	1	16	3.45	2	21	3	24			16	3.45
Seneca	1.96	2	16	3.52	2	3	19	4.18	2	16	3	19	1		20	4.41
Steuben	4.00	2	25	2.69	4	7.5	32.5	3.50	2	30	2	32	4		36.5	3.93
Suffolk	5.92	3	27.5	2.00	2	3	30.5	2.22	6	33	3	36	8	2.5	41	2.99
Sullivan	2.00	1	5	1.08	2	1	6	1.29	1	3	x	x			6	1.29
Tioga	1.00	1	3	1.29	1	.5	3.5	1.51	1	x	2	x			3.5	1.51
Tompkins	1.42	1	3	.91	1	.5	3.5	1.06	x	x	x	x			3.5	1.06
Ulster	2.00	2	x	x	2	3	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Warren	1.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0
Washington	1.17	1	8	2.95	1	1.5	9.5	3.51	1	4	1	5			9.5	3.51
Wayne	2.96	3	8	1.17	3	3.5	11.5	1.68	3	8	4	12	10		21.5	3.13
Westchester	2.00	1	2	.43	0	0	2	.43	1	3	0	3	1	10	13	2.80
Wyoming	3.00	3	17	2.44	0	0	17	2.44	3	x	8	x	4		21	3.02
Yates	2.00	2	3	.65	2	1	4	.86	x	?	0	?			4	.86

[a] x = No information

[b] ? = Uncertain

[c] This agent left April, 1967 to become a cooperative extension specialist.

APPENDIX B

SOME BRIEF ACCOUNTS AND COMMENTS RELATIVE TO THE INITIATION OF YEAR-ROUND FARM LABOR PROGRAMS

Some Brief Accounts and Comments Relative to The Initiation of Year-round Farm Labor Programs

---

County Agents

	No. of agents
1. Brief accounts of initiating farm labor program	5

High priority when discussing developments, problems, etc. with advisory committee members--other farmers. Discussions with Prof. Frank of I. & L.R. Kept an eye open for articles in trade journals, magazines, numerous phone calls and visits with Dick Klatt of State Labor Department.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

In 1965 held two exploratory meetings to determine needs and problems. Participation was due to farmers' recognition that there was a problem about which something could be done and we were willing to help.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Asked about interest in problem at other dairy farmer meetings; promoted meeting. Worked with New York State Division of Employment (farm representative) in conducting two-stage farm labor survey which had good response (33%). Farm interest was there.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Appointed labor committee to outline problems. Designed and carried out a series of five discussion-method learning experiences--to teach human relations in personnel management (excellent). Carried out two lecture method sessions at winter dairy school (poor).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

No. of
agents

We organized a farm labor study committee made up of 14 farmers and two agri-businessmen. They met several times to consider problems and possible areas of activity. One direct result was the securing of a farm labor representative to serve the Cortland County area.

2. Used survey of labor practices in farm management which was summarized by a college extension staff member and discussed at meetings. 1

3. Through commodity (usually dairy) committees or meetings. 5

Their (farmers') questions individually plus Dairy Commodity Committee recommendation.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

This is not a specific program, but a problem cited by the Dairy Program Committee. Our educational program to start this fall will deal with better understanding of the labor relations problem by employers.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Program efforts in this area began with dairy committee meeting at which labor case studies were used.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Incorporated it with winter crops and dairy meetings.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Scheduled farm labor relationships as part of sequential large dairy farm workshop meetings (three days in consecutive weeks).

No. of agents

4. Through newsletters and other mass media 3

Set up a series of four job instruction meetings--sent out news releases and service letter.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Service letter--announced on radio and in newspaper.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Newspapers, Farm and Home News, and radio.

5. They (farmers) showed concern--we reacted. . . . 1

6. Primarily through individual contacts. 3

Primarily individual contact and then held the Labor Management School with Washington County.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Sent out service letter with poor response and followed it with individual visits.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Sent out letter. Got one sign-up. Made contacts with farmers mostly at other meetings to get sign-ups.

7. Difficult to secure participation. 1

It's extremely difficult to get farmers to participate. Some will take an active part as directors of Farm Labor Co-op if the Co-op can supply good labor. Turnout at farm labor meetings has been very poor in recent years. Can get much more interest in meetings or demonstrations on how to use an irrigation pipe mover, for example, to eliminate labor.

Cooperative Extension Specialists--Agriculture

	No. of specialists
1. Included farm labor as a topic at a dairy mechanization meeting	1
2. Area floriculture and ornamental industry hurting for "semi-skilled" and skilled labor. Planned and conducted panel discussion using representatives speaking for the industry, Vo-Ag, two-year agricultural and technical schools, and four-year colleges	1

APPENDIX C

THREE FARM LABOR PROGRAMS: 1967

Farm Labor Program: 1967
Monroe County

The interest on my part in working with farm labor and farm labor programs was a gradual build-up. In making farm contacts with individuals and at meetings, it seemed the topic of labor problems always came up. We'd hold our neighborhood meetings on costs, for example, and the discussions invariably drifted to this area. So there was a gradual awakening to the situation. This developed further on some trips. For example, we went to a potato meeting down in the southern part of the state and several farmers rode in the car and made a conscious point of discussing labor. Then again, in some neighborhood meetings that were held on other subject matter it was specifically planned to get the growers to talk in the labor area. The farm labor situation was discussed in staff conferences of agents, when we were considering the needs behind the county extension program. We agreed that this was a need, with one member challenging, 'What are we going to do about it?' and the answer was the same as the one I've often given, 'We don't know what we're going to do, but Extension doesn't necessarily back off.' We try to find a need and then try to find a way of answering it and that's about the way we've been functioning. We still don't know just how to proceed in attacking this need. After staff discussion the question was brought up at our Executive Committee that this was a need. Then our directors indicated that we should pursue the matter and consider channeling more of extension's efforts in this direction. The year 1967 has seen the focusing of a considerable effort on this problem.

We made an attempt with several other counties to have a one-day meeting. This was branching out and tying in with the type of work that we're doing in the area now. Dick Norton on fruit and I on vegetables began contacting the leading farmers in other counties and also contacting other agents for approval for a one-day event, recognizing we did not have ready answers, but with these objectives: 'What are the motivations of a worker?' and 'What is a farm worker?' As our letter to possible participants indicated: 'Let's take a look on the inside of a farm worker.' And the other part of the program was: 'What's inside the employer?' 'How does he react to his farm laborers?' This approach was arrived at after interviews with professionals in the field of labor relations. This, incidentally, was a long drawn-out procedure. I was on the phone with a man in Buffalo and made calls to Professor Frank of the I. & L.R. School at Cornell. We spent an afternoon with two of these professionals just talking about what we were going to try to do. And then who to get for speakers was the next item. We talked about possible people from the sociology or psychology department down at Cornell but didn't strike the right chord. Eventually, we wound up with the Manpower Training Center in the city of Rochester. We went down to spend some time with the director and a couple of his men and found that they would have something for us--insight into the underprivileged person--what motivates him, what his background is. We thought that this type of person, because of his lack of skill, lack of background, would be the same in agricultural as industrial employment. Why does he work? Why doesn't he work? Why doesn't he react as the employer wants him to?

Our meeting of farmers was held early in the year. We had about 50 present, representing Monroe, Genesee, and Orleans counties. Included were fruit, vegetable, and dairy men. Our hopes were for greater attendance. In addition to the I. & L.R. assistance, the R. T. French Company supplied us with one of their instructors who spent an afternoon on some specific items, rather than basic understanding. The specifics included how you give directions or instructions to workers. The man from R. T. French Company works for them in training foremen. We had Dr.

Friedland of I. & L.R. who gave a report of his experiences with a migrant labor study.

To summarize out first major meeting of this kind, we had some folks who came and wanted to get a recipe. They wanted to know how to make a cake rather than the principles of how yeast works and this was what we were after--what is yeast, and how does it function. I felt that this was just one step in the long-term program and from that standpoint I'm satisfied. I've talked with some growers since, people who participated in a series of meetings that were held with the cooperation of I. & L.R. people from Buffalo and they're sensing what we're after and when I hear this, it gives me encouragement to continue with what I call the fundamental type of thing. Some of them at the meeting felt that what they wanted to know was if a man doesn't work, how can he be made to work, and they wanted this help from one meeting. On the other hand, others have indicated that they felt what we were giving them was helping them over the long pull.

Another aspect of our county program was led by Herb Johnson, our dairy agent. He invited Lou Cunningham to sit with farmers in an informal discussion group and talk about farm labor. Herb asked about 12 or 14 of the leading dairy operators who were concerned and interested in labor. Under Cunningham's leadership, they discussed what is our problem. Again, this is a basic approach which considers what is the problem and how do we handle it, rather than giving an answer which one can take home and use to solve an immediate problem. As an additional step, Dick Norton and I were invited by Professors Spalding and Frank to participate in a pilot group of agents to spend some time in training at Cornell and then come back to the county and conduct a series of four meetings. We followed through with this. The timing was completely off for fruit and vegetable men. We were well into plowing time in the spring. However, we got a fair sign-up. We had around 15 people and we only had one full drop-out. Most of the people were good attendants. Again our approach was on basic principles and understandings of the relationship between employer and employee. Dick and I are both enthusiastic about this experience. We've contacted Professor Spalding so we can get this kind of activity instituted in November and December before the winter meeting season begins and concentrate on it before we get into the production matters.

Another phase of our activity has been to get acquainted with the situation in the Rochester community and learn about its social agencies and other people that are by profession, or by interest in people alone, getting themselves involved with the migrant labor situation. One of the farmers informed me of a meeting that was going to be held at a church in the village of Scottsville concerning what might be done about a specific labor camp. When he mentioned some of the names who were going to be there, primarily one, Dr. Rabebaugh, who was involved in a very explosive situation a year ago, I thought it would be a good opportunity to see him functioning with a group. So at the invitation of the farmer I contacted the chairman of the group that was acting in Scottsville and got approval to participate to some extent with Dr. Rabebaugh and the others as they were deliberating about the migrant labor camp at Garbutt. At a series of four meetings which they had, I got to know other names and other people and became aware of the Council of Social Agencies and the people in the power structure, or the activists in the social-political developments involving labor in the Rochester area.

Dr. Rabebaugh is a staff member of the University of Rochester who conducted the health clinics in migrant labor camps in 1966 and is doing the same in 1967. In 1966 he was instrumental in moving people from a certain labor camp to a motel in Rochester and then getting paid transportation to

Florida for them. He was also instrumental in getting the State Human Relations Commission to condemn the camp. Their action was not legal and the condemnation was withdrawn. He was involved in a touchy situation which made the headlines. So, as I say, my interest in the Garbutt situation was not just Dr. Rabebaugh himself but the whole climate of this type of thing. This activity proved to be very helpful for a program initiated this year by the County Human Relations Commission. Because federal funds for work in labor situations were decreased, the county was approached to provide the money. The county decided to turn its money over to the County Human Relations Commission, which is a subordinate governmental agency. Again because I had gotten involved with the power structure, I was able to participate in this procedure. Incidentally, through Extension's contact with this particular program of the Human Relations Commission, we were contacted by one of our assemblymen, who in turn contacted the county Board of Supervisors which decided that they wanted to have a program on migrant labor. The question for Extension was: What could we do for the camp operators, to get them informed, involved, and receptive?

The Extension Service called several meetings of farmers. The chairman of the County Human Relations Commission explained the program, farmers endorsed it, and following the farmers' endorsement, the county legislature formally appropriated a sum for employing two people to work on the program. This has been called the Rural Poverty Program with a staff of two men. Basically, 90 percent of their interest is seeing to it that conditions are as they ought to be in the migrant camps. The Council of Social Agencies, a power group in the city, felt that this program should be theirs and it got to be a sticky situation. It is anticipated that the two political leaders who initiated the efforts leading to the Rural Poverty Program will direct the program as it has started.

After the formation of the Rural Poverty Program there was a matter of selection of an Advisory Board. I should add at this point that the program is not only to minister to the needs of migrant workers, but its Advisory Board is expected to serve as an arbitrator. In fact this is the reason the farmers accepted the program. If a conflict should arise, they thought they would have a representative group of citizens who understand farming and farm labor problems and can review situations with equanimity.

We were also involved with a representative from the State Labor Department in a number of surveys in order to obtain an inventory of farm labor in the county. We did a preliminary survey through which we secured numbers, and then we started working on a survey of operators to find who the workers are, what their skills are, and what skills they need. This survey has been delayed, but will be done.

Another limited phase of our labor work was interviewing farm laborers on several farms. This was done in cooperation with the Office of Extension Studies. We tried to get their reactions as to what they expected and how they look on farm employment. There was a limited bit of follow-up to this. One farmer was having some difficulties with one of his workers and he wanted some assistance on how to work out a relationship, and, having already interviewed the worker, I had a better idea of what his outlook was and what sort of a temperament he had. I was able to counsel better with the farmer as to how to work with this individual.

There is, however, a lack of exact knowledge as to what to do. I'm very pleased to see the assistance and the willingness of the I. & L.R. College to be involved in this area. I think much of what we've seen has come from them. It's a matter of adapting it, perhaps, to agricultural situations. We have been especially interested in the year-round farm laborer and have been challenged on this emphasis by a number of people. Our answer is that the labor area is difficult, and that we had better concentrate on the laborer who is needed the year 'round.

What I have learned from these activities has been that we have here a wide-open field, a wide-open need. Some of the farmers are reacting favorably to our efforts. For example, at the Vegetable Advisory Committee for the three-county program, one farmer who had been exposed to some of these activities, said, 'Whatever you do, if it's varieties, if it's weed control, if it's insects, keep in mind how this ties in with the labor picture. Labor is the number one item for me on the fruit and vegetable farm that I have and when you talk about a machine, think about how it affects the labor picture; think of a variety, how it affects the labor picture.' And I believe that more and more growers are thinking this way. I continue to see it as a challenge. I don't see any direct measurement of results such as when you go out and put on a chemical and go out five days later and see what's happened. That to me is probably one of the biggest limitations of it, both from the standpoint of indicating to someone else what you've accomplished or even of personal satisfaction. It's kind of hard to measure because, the way I see it, it's working on human understanding and relationships rather than a specific spoon-feeding item, as some of the farmers thought when they came to our first meeting. They primarily wanted to know how to get more work out of their laborers.

Our farmers, both on our advisory committees and on our Executive Committee have said, 'Labor is killing us.' We used to hear a similar cry years ago, 'You've got to help us market our crop. Marketing is killing us.' And when you've boiled it down, what they meant about marketing was getting another dollar for 100 lbs. of milk, rather than for his understanding what the marketing process was or anything else. And now they're saying, 'Labor is the number one item.' I'm not quite sure what they're asking for. They are indicating to us that they can't get enough labor to harvest the crops, the labor they have is smashing the equipment, they don't know quite how to get along with their labor. They're telling us labor is our problem, but I can't quite get a feeling of what they really want. Some of the good, sound-thinking ones seem to recognize what's going on. The others are expecting an easy answer and that's how I would assess what they're saying. I think if you ask anyone if it is more important to control weeds or the labor situation, the answer they'd give would be labor, pretty well across the board. The farmer senses a problem, but he has no clear definition of it.

We're planning on conducting additional series of small-group discussions, Dick Norton and I, within our own county. This will also involve Genesee and Orleans counties. We'll get small groups in so they will have a better understanding of themselves as employers, a better understanding of their workers and then, on the basis of this, they will be better prepared to meet their labor situations. I've seen farming develop from predominantly one-man operations with an occasional hired man to operations which are complex, employing 10 or 15 people. They've grown in size, but they have not grown in the desire or the ability to manage people. As I see it, this is a challenge to work at--for them to realize that this change has taken place--that they have to learn managerial skill in addition to the technology of repairing a tractor or choosing the right variety.

Up to now, the farmers who have reacted positively to our notices have basically been those who have thought about the labor problem and are willing to face it. Not many who participate in our meetings will say,'The worker is dumb, there's no help for him.' I might say though that over the last three or four years some who have said this aren't saying it now.

Surprisingly, Extension has not been criticized for its efforts on farm labor. Although they may be questioning in their minds, 'What does Extension know about it?', the farmers have been coming back and asking for more. My initial reluctance in discussing farm labor with the operator was not unlike my original inhibition in asking farmers about their financial records. And it's been surprising, whenever I got the courage up to ask a man about his labor problems, how he'll give some very personal information. I asked one farmer how he supervised and managed and related to his help, what sort of an incentive system he had, how much responsibility he gave to his workers. I expected him to be negative, but he pulled me in by his desk and there we sat for an hour just talking back and forth freely about how he relates to his labor.

Prepared by Cooperative Extension Agent
Edwin E. Motsenbocker

Farm Labor Program: 1967
Seneca County

Our earlier survey of 70 dairy farmers had indicated that 47 percent of the farmers employing labor had difficulty getting hired help. We have very few vegetable or fruit type operations in the county where large numbers of seasonal help are managed. However, there are farmers who hire one or two men and, with the emphasis on size of business, we find that not being able to manage labor is a drawback on many farms in the county. Some one-man farmers say, 'I only want what I can do by myself because you cannot depend on hired help.' This attitude in farming today can be the downfall of many farmers. We believe these meetings on farm labor may be of help in changing the attitudes of this type of individual as well as the farmer who is already managing hired labor.

We sent out a letter to the membership describing the program which was outlined by the college at out training sessions. This letter was sent to the main membership list. The response we got from this letter was only one man signing up.

We then contacted people at other meetings in the county, and also on a personal basis to get a list of 15 sign-ups for the meeting.

Out of the 15 sign-ups, 11 participated in two or more meetings with eight or nine being present for three or more meetings.

The meetings carried on were those that were outlined in the training session given by Professors Robert Spalding and William Frank.

We worked together with our sessions with one man leading discussion, and the other writing on the blackboard, passing out material, etc. This responsibility changed at each session.

The individual response of the people that participated was very good. With the exception of a few illustrations which, we understand, have been changed, the material presented seemed to prompt discussion from the group.

The participants were a mixture of all types of farmers including cash crop, dairy, and poultry with various degrees of formal education.

A test prepared by the Office of Extension Studies was given before and after the sessions, and it showed that a gain of 14.7 percent of correct answers was made. This shows that there was some response to the training that was given to the people participating. However, how much of this was put into actual practice remains to be seen.

As to future plans, we intend to conduct this program in the county again this year with a different group of farmers. As a follow-up to the 1967 and 1968 meetings, we would like to have a joint meeting of the two groups at a local factory to compare labor problems between factory and farm.

In the future, we think that this activity will be very well accepted in extension work.

The idea of participants sharing each other's experiences, and contributing to the sessions through role playing, discussions, and studying problem situations with discussion guides is an interesting way of presenting material.

We believe this method of teaching may become more widely used in extension work in the future.

Prepared by Cooperative Extension Agents:

William H. Brown
Jesse B. Hannan

A Pilot Program in Personnel Management Training: 1967
Steuben County

Steuben County's pilot effort in training farm operators in personnel management evolved over time as I undertook various studies of personnel management and sociology and came to believe this knowledge might be relevant to the farm labor problem. Field experience and previous study was brought to a climax when I undertook graduate study in various subjects dealing with personnel management and sociology. It was probably motivated by a cry of farm operators that the Extension Service should help them with their farm labor problem. I further came to understand that it is insufficient to deal with this problem purely in terms of labor efficiency, economics, public policy or simply to keep farm operators posted on relevant legislative information.

Our educational efforts dealing with the farm labor problem have focused entirely on farm employers. It has been aimed primarily at helping them to understand the social and human relations context of the problem. It deals with the attitude not only of employers, but also the public and individual workers. Attitudes develop from the values and knowledge of people and therefore are slow to change.

Because attitudes seem to be involved, our regular kinds of Cooperative Extension learning experiences seem insufficient. This is to say that such learning experiences as mass media and the lecture method can only hope to help individuals become aware of existing information. Therefore, our pilot program was designed to utilize group dynamics as a means of trying to increase the interaction of knowledge with people in group discussion.

This pilot effort grew out of a scheme which we had devised, then hoped for its acceptance. Initially our executive committee appointed a farm labor program committee to meet with our agent staff to help us brainstorm the problems which are relevant to the total problem. When the committee was appointed we proceeded to get them together in a brainstorming session. When the problems were outlined, we then propositioned them with an offer to carry out a series of discussion method learning experiences in which they would participate. They agreed, and we set them up.

The discussion method series was carried out with about 12 participants in five weekly evening two-hour sessions. Agent Everett and I designed and led this series with the help of three guest discussion leaders. The first session was led by the agent and merely presented some frames of reference which deal with personnel management in order to help lay a base of communication with the group. The second session was on training and was carried out with the help of Professor Emil Mesics of I. & L.R. The third session was on compensation and was carried out with the help of Professor Lou Cunningham from Agricultural Economics. The subject at the fourth session was supervision with Professor Bob Bruce from Education. At the fifth and concluding session we presented five case studies provided by the survey of farm operators made by a graduate student in I. & L.R. during the summer of 1966. Though the earlier four sessions were more scholarly and probably more capably led, it seemed that the participants interacted more and expressed more satisfaction for this final case method of presentation.

Our audience was our farm labor committee, made up of 14 farm operators plus the local assistant secretary of Farmers Cooperative Credit and the farm labor representative of the New York State Employment Service. Of the 16 agreeing to participate, 12 showed up at the first meeting and continued through the following five sessions with no more than about a half-dozen absences. Two operators who have partners often sent their partner as a substitute. The four who did not respond to the original problem identification session did not respond to the series of five educational sessions.

It's impossible for us to fully evaluate the results of this pilot effort. We did attempt to measure attitudes by giving the participants a small test before and after the series. This measurement of attitudinal change was designed and summarized by Professor Frank Alexander. It does show some positive change. There are limitations to the validity of this measurement because we may have contaminated the participants at the problem identification meeting ahead of the first test. The validity might also be questioned because of our failure to provide or anticipate subject matter to be covered; therefore the questions and answers were not entirely relevant to the learning experience. If our ability to determine effectiveness in terms of informal feedback is valid, then the results seem positive because of the highly satisfying interaction between pupil and instructor during the school plus considerable favorable comment by the participants at the conclusion of the school.

It pleased us to learn that the series of learning experiences designed by Dr. William Frank and Dr. Robert Spalding are along the same lines. In the same way these learning experiences emphasized the human and social context of personnel management. And the series also attempts to speed up attitudinal change by utilizing the group dynamics kinds of learning experiences. Subject matter seems very similar. This series seems more sophisticated than ours. Our future program will probably adopt this series as an easier way to do it than to modify our first experience. Both programs seem to have the same objectives and should come up with similar results.

We would like to try to organize at least two and hopefully more groups who might be put through this kind of learning experience this winter. Though our staff will be severely curtailed in its ability to handle other work this winter, we will try to put some priority on moving further into this field.

Another farm labor activity which we hope to develop this winter will be one in which we utilize this farm labor committee within our resources development program to help the Board of Cooperative Educational Services identify farm labor skills for which they might design training of high school students. Here again we will be limited in our own ability to put resources on the project, but we will try to give it priority. Our objective here is two-fold, to help broaden and improve the farm operator's ability to recruit training in his farm help, and to help our people in formal education design relevant vocational training which will contribute to human resource development.

In the future, Cooperative Extension will have to utilize more and more of this kind of activity for two reasons: 1) to improve the educational interaction of our learning experiences; and 2) to carry out more problem centered activities. If this is a valid notion, then the whole family of Extension Service personnel will need greater expertise in the newer concepts of programming and teaching. Research will need to be done with a high degree of specialization in subject matter fields. But if Extension is to provide a communicative linkage between the final need and specialized subject matter, then emphasis will need to be placed on the professional ability of workers in the field to identify need and initiate linkage with appropriate information and knowledge accumulated by specialists. For our people to specialize in subject matter alone is insufficient since this tendency is apt to distract from an equal need to communicate. It is then my notion that research workers must strive for this specialization in accumulating knowledge, but that Extension must find new ways and develop a broadened expertise in effecting the necessary communication between the needs of people and accumulated knowledge. The communicative ability of instructional people seems most important.

Prepared by Cooperative Extension Agent
Theodore W. Markham

APPENDIX D

MAN-YEARS OF COUNTY STAFFS FOR 1966-67

Table 1

Number and Percentage Distribution of Counties According to Number of Staff Man-Years (Number of Agents) for 1966-67

Number of man-years	Counties	
	Number	Percent
less than 1	3	5
1.0 - 1.9	12	21
2.0 - 2.9	24	43
3.0 - 3.9	7	13
4.0 - 4.9	6	11
5.0 - 5.9	3	5
6.0 - 6.9	1	2
Total	56	100
Mean	2.47	

For 43 counties, the mean number of agents devoting time to year-round farm labor (exclusive of training) was 2.0.

APPENDIX E

AGENTS WHO ARE EXPECTED TO DEVOTE TIME TO YEAR-ROUND FARM LABOR IN 1967-68

Agents Who Are Expected to Devote Time To Year-round Farm Labor in 1967-68

Albany	L. M. Palmer J. E. Huth
Allegany	C. W. Hebblethwaite
Broome	O. C. Barber C. H. Padgham
Cattaraugus	J. D. Hill
Cayuga	G. E. Monroe W. C. Wasserman
Chautauqua	G. W. Cline T. D. Jordan R. D. Zimmer
Chemung	J. Dell N. Orr
Chenango	E. G. Voss W. E. Worth
Columbia	W. M. Barry
Cortland	H. I. Blixt
Delaware	P. G. Mattern T. E. Schultz
Dutchess	L. J. Rollins H. Williams
Erie	J. A. Birkland I. A. Gillow T. Jorgensen E. W. Rutkowski E. D. Howes
Franklin	W. B. Andrews
Genesee	D. G. Burns
Greene	H. B. Harris
Jefferson	V. C. Travis N. W. Pauling, Jr. T. P. Solan
Lewis	C. F. Handy C. R. Pearce
Livingston	R. G. Parker

Madison	R. M. Cary
Monroe	E. E. Motsenbocker
	R. L. Norton
	H. E. Johnson
Niagara	R. L. Pease
	R. R. Husted
	L. A. Dickerson
Oneida	E. J. Kresse
Onondaga	D. W. Hammond
	W. M. Quinn
	A. Aja, Jr.
	W. G. Neuhauser
Ontario	L. N. Davis
Orange	W. S. Pendergast
	H. A. Smith, Jr.
	C. G. Boynton
Orleans	S. C. Cleveland
	R. S. Bostdorff
Putnam	H. E. White
Rensselaer	P. W. Bemis
	D. A. Thompson
St. Lawrence	D. E. Huddleston
	K. R. Norton
	R. K. Lydman
Saratoga	M. D. Wrisley
	D. R. Wood
Schuyler	R. C. Bornholdt
	N. L. Orr
Seneca	J. B. Hannan
	W. H. Brown
Steuben	T. W. Markham
	J. B. Sieczka
Suffolk	H. D. Wells
	D. H. Fricke
	R. N. Freeman
	C. F. Scheer
	R. H. Brewster
	W. J. Sanok
Tioga	R. E. Eschler
Washington	L. G. Nuffer

Wayne	A. A. Arnold E. L. Datthyn R. C. Nichols
Westchester	W. S. Androsko
Wyoming	J. L. Fendick S. F. Smith M. J. Button

APPENDIX F

LABOR ACTIVITIES FROM COUNTY PROGRAMS AND PLANS OF WORK: 1967-68

Table 1

Number of Counties and Cooperative Extension Specialists According to Labor Activities Mentioned in Programs and Plans of Work for 1967-68

	Number of plans mentioning activities	
Activities	Counties[a]	Cooperative extension specialists[b]
1. Labor management schools, series of meetings, or a meeting	13	
2. Regional labor meetings	2[c]	
3. Individual consultation on farm labor with farmers and others	7	1
4. Farm labor activities involving committees--Executive Committee, Farm Labor Study Committee, or Farm Labor Advisory Committee	3	
5. Service letters, circular letters, news articles, County News, and other publications	9	1
6. Farm labor surveys in cooperation with other agencies	2	
7. Preparation of special material on farm labor--successful case histories on employer-worker relations, handbook on responsibilities of farm employer to employees	2	
8. General		
a. Include topics and speakers on farm labor when scheduling subject matter meetings	1	
b. Labor management through mass media		1

---

[a] The program and plans of work of 47 counties were examined. Twenty-seven counties indicated some kind of activity or activities.

[b] The program and plans of work of seven cooperative extension specialists were examined. Two cooperative extension specialists indicated some kind of activity or activities.

[c] Possibly four or more additional counties.

	Number of plans mentioning activities	
Activities	Counties	Cooperative extension specialists
c. Cooperate with college on labor program	1	
d. Labor management	1	
e. Continue to stress labor management	1	
f. Cooperate with Migrant Labor Committee of Council of Churches	1	
g. Encourage vegetable growers to work closely with fruit growers in recruitment, housing, and efficient use of labor through crop season	1	
h. Labor was ranked eighth out of 12 major problems by regional administrative and program committees; labor was ranked seventh out of nine problems for major emphasis		1
9. Miscellaneous		
a. Interview workers who have left farm employment for other work	1	
b. Interview farm workers as to likes, dislikes, ideas for improving work situation	1	
c. Training meetings for inexperienced pickers	1	
d. Work with New York State Employment Service on recruitment policies for migrant labor	1	
e. Cooperate with other Finger Lakes counties and New York Employment Service on recruitment of grape pickers	1	

APPENDIX G

RELATIONSHIP OF STAFF INPUT ON LABOR TO TOTAL STAFF TIME

Table 1

Number Distribution of Counties According to Percent of Total Staff Time Devoted to Labor (Year-round, Migrant, Nursery-Landscape-Garden Center) And Training on Labor Matters, by Number of Staff Man-Years: 1966-67[a]

Percent of total staff time devoted to labor	Number of staff man-years							
	Less than 1	1.0-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-3.9	4.0-4.9	5.0-5.9	6.0-6.9	Total
None	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	3
0.10 - 0.99	--	3	8	3	--	1	--	15
1.00 - 1.99	--	5	6	3	3	--	1	18
2.00 - 2.99	2	--	1	--	--	1	--	4
3.00 - 3.99	--	1	3	1	2	--	--	7
4.00 - 4.99	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	2
5.00 - 5.99	--	--	2	--	1	1	--	4
Total	2	12	22	7	6	3	1	53

---

[a] The product-moment correlation coefficient for staff input on labor in relation to total staff time for the 53 counties included in this table is .18 which is not significantly different from zero at .05.

APPENDIX H

COLLEGE STAFF MEMBERS DEVOTING TIME TO YEAR-ROUND FARM LABOR

College Staff Members Devoting Time to Year-round Farm Labor

Agricultural Economics

C. Arthur Bratton
Lowell Cunningham
George Conneman
Bennett A. Dominick, Jr.
R. Brian How
Stanley W. Warren

Agricultural Engineering

Orval C. French
Everett D. Markwardt
Hollis R. Davis
Edward W. Foss
Richard W. Guest
John W. Layer
Carl S. Winkelblech

Animal Science

James D. Burke
Alexander Meek
Robert Spalding

Communication Arts

William B. Ward
Robert J. Ames
James E. Lawrence
David Nurmi

Conservation

Fred Winch
Wayne T. Bell
Harlan Brumsted
Alexander Dickson

Floriculture & Ornamental Horticulture[a]

John Seeley
Carl Gortzig
Alfred Pridham

Rural Sociology

Gordon J. Cummings
Olaf F. Larson

Vegetable Crops

Philip Minges
Francis Isenberg

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUN 11 1968
on Adult Education

---

[a] The time of this departmental staff was devoted to labor problems of nursery, landscape, and garden center operators.